

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXCV.

FEBRUARY, 1898.

AMERICA'S INTERESTS IN CHINA.

BY GENERAL JAMES H. WILSON.

IN order that the present crisis in China may be properly understood, and that our real stake—the commercial and diplomatic interests of the United States—in that far-away region may be properly considered, a glance at the country, the people, and the government seems to be necessary.

Fortunately, China has long since ceased to be a land of mystery. From the days of Marco Polo and Ibn Batuta its innermost recesses have been known to the world. In later years it has been more fully explored in all directions by Jesuits, missionaries, and scientific travellers. Its limits, its physical conformation, and its climate have been described with sufficient accuracy. Its mineral resources, which are of great variety and vast extent, but almost entirely undeveloped, have aroused the interest and excited the cupidity of foreign promoters and financiers. Full details and particulars can be had from the cyclopædias on all these points, but a more specific reference to the area and population of the Empire will perhaps serve better than anything else to arrest the attention of this country and its statesmen to the enormous importance of the events which are now taking place in the far East.

China proper and Exterior China, including the eighteen

VOL. CLXVI.—NO. 495.

9

Copyright, 1898, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

densely populated provinces and the surrounding desert region, constitute what is known as the Chinese Empire. It extends from the Pacific Ocean, where it has a coast line of about 2,500 miles, to Central Asia, and covers an area of something over 5,000,000 square miles, or nearly one-tenth of the habitable globe. Its population has never been accurately enumerated, but it has been estimated variously from a fifth to a third of all the people in the world ! There may be anywhere from three hundred to four hundred millions. One guess is as good as another, but the latter has the endorsement of Sir Robert Hart, Commissioner of the Imperial Maritime Customs, and may be considered the more trustworthy.

The average condition of these people, as contrasted with those of Western nations, is one of great poverty, though it would be a mistake to assume that they are peculiarly miserable and unhappy, except at times in the region of famine, which, from climatic conditions, frequently prevails, and, owing to great distances and the lack of railroad transportation, can hardly ever be relieved or mitigated. Living almost entirely by agriculture and the accessory callings, the Chinese contribute but little per capita to international commerce. They are a remarkably homogeneous, docile, industrious, and robust people, frugal and kindly in their habits, with no indications of ever having been aggressive and warlike in temper. Belonging to the Turanian race, it is becoming the fashion to designate them as the "Yellow Peril," and to conjure up harrowing visions of a devastated and ruined world when they shall learn their power and sally forth for rapine and conquest. More than one European writer, and notably Professor Pearson, have predicted that they will yet dominate the earth by force of arms or ruin it by competition in commerce. Without recounting the arguments upon which this opinion is based, it is here sufficient to state that, so far as history shows, the Chinese race are about as much of a menace to the rest of the world as the lamb in the fable was to the wolf.

Obviously, this "Peril," be it great or small, may be dismissed for the present with the suggestion that, if the Chinese cannot defend themselves from a few thousand Japanese "*wojen*" (or dwarfs), a still smaller number of Russians, or a couple of German cruisers, they can hardly hope for several generations to be able to menace seriously the rest of the world as conquerors. When it is further considered that they have but little surplus capital and few

if any of the appliances of modern civilization, and have yet to supply themselves altogether with railroads, rolling mills, furnaces and factories, and to develop their mines of coal, iron, copper, lead and precious metals, before they can seriously think of satisfying their own demands for manufactured goods, wares, and merchandise, much less of entering into active competition with other nations, practical statesmen may well dismiss these apprehensions for the present. Yet China is awakening from the lethargy of ages, and is joining slowly but certainly in the march of modern progress. It must not be forgotten, however, that while she is moving her great exemplars will advance still further. Her ancient and complete isolation which has hitherto kept her stagnant in the background, and which was primarily due to the wide expanse of desert, steppe, and mountains separating her from the civilized world on the land side and to an almost illimitable waste of waters on the ocean side, was first broken seriously in upon by the big ships of modern days. The approach and early completion of the Trans-Siberian railroad to Vladivostok, Port Arthur, and ultimately to Peking, the construction of trunk railway connections along the principal trade routes of the interior, and the multiplication of the great steamship lines which already connect her ports with all parts of the world, will surely at no distant day open her innermost recesses to the trade and influence of the more progressive nations.

It cannot be too frequently repeated that the peculiarities of civilization and government and the extraordinary conservatism of the Chinese are mainly due to that isolation which has remained unbroken from the beginning of time to within less than a half century, but fortunately may now be regarded as quite at an end forever.

If human experience is of any value, or has any application to this case, nothing can be more certain than that the Chinese must ultimately move as all other races and nations have moved. They have similar wants, similar affections, and similar interests, and must gratify them by means similar to those employed by other peoples. And so it may be safely assumed that when they do seriously set about the task of bettering their condition and improving their civilization and government they will proceed much as other people have proceeded. Their efforts will be followed by success and failures in the usual proportions. They will have the

usual amount of bright anticipations and bitter disappointments ; the usual proportion of great men and small ones, and possibly an unusual proportion of dishonest men and scoundrels ; but withal, they are sure, if left alone, and possibly if not left alone, by outsiders, to progress both in the arts of peace and in the arts of war, and to grow in wealth and power.

Manifestly, the new economic changes which we may count upon with absolute confidence will be such as grow out of the construction of railroads, the opening of mines, and the erection of furnaces, rolling mills, factories, and shipyards, and generally the better employment of labor ; wages will rise, the scale of living and expenditure will improve, which in turn will create a demand for better food, better clothing, better furniture, and better houses. When the extent of the country and the almost infinite number of the people are considered, together with the enormous amount of work to be done in order to bring them abreast of even the poorest people of Europe and America in respect to the facilities and comforts of civilized life and to the means of national defence, it will be apparent that they will not only have all they can do at home for the next half-century at least, and possibly even for the entire century or longer, but also will be compelled to borrow heavily and to buy largely from foreign nations of the things which they cannot yet nor soon produce. Of course if they buy they will have to pay, which they can do only in the precious metals, and in the products which now constitute their principal articles of commerce.

The isolation and conservatism of the Chinese had their counterpart with the Japanese, the history of whose extraordinary progress is now fully known to the world, and need not be dwelt upon here. While it is not to be denied that the circumstances which surrounded Japan were different from those which surround China, it may be fairly claimed that the difference was one of extent rather than of character. The awakening must come and progress must follow in one case as surely as it did in the other ; but inasmuch as the area of the Chinese Empire is twenty-five times as great, and its population probably ten times that of the Japanese dominions, the aggregate contributions of the former to the progressive forces and movements of the age, when once fully developed, must be many times greater than any that have ever yet made themselves felt in the Asiatic world. Hence it will be

perceived that the territorial possessions and commercial prizes to be struggled for by the great powers are of supreme value, and well calculated not only to arouse their cupidity and stimulate their enterprise, but to dull their consciences as well.

When it is remembered that British and Russian conquest in Asia has already resulted in the division of all of that continent, except Turkey in the West, and China in the East, between the conquerors; that France has helped herself to Tonquin, Cochin China, and part of Siam, and is now seeking to further extend both her absolute sway and commercial influence; that Germany has, under a flimsy pretext, seized Kiao Chou Bay and forced the Chinese government to give her a long "lease of sovereignty" on the mainland and adjacent waters; that the Chinese buffer states and outlying dependencies of vast extent have been seized one after another, and above all that no conquered territory anywhere in Asia, except that which was held for a while by Russia about Kuldja in the far northwest of Chinese Tartary, has been relinquished to its rightful owner by any European power during this century, the Chinese Boards and ministers may well feel profoundly alarmed at the "glaring beasts" which now seem to threaten their country with dismemberment and destruction.

It is true that their government is a government of conquest and corruption, the history of which is for the most part the history of violence, intrigue and anarchy, with only here and there a great ruler to stay the hand of plunder and to save the country from absolute ruin. The reigning dynasty is effete and incompetent, the boards of government are cumbersome and inefficient, and the leading men generally weak or powerless. But these are misfortunes inherited from a past age. They call for reform and regeneration, which may be had with the assistance and advice of foreign nations rather than by spoliation and dismemberment.

And yet it must not be forgotten that China has made substantial progress for the last fifty years, especially since the capture of the Taku forts and Peking by the allied French and British armies in 1861, and the termination of the Taiping rebellion in 1863. The most potential influence in this movement has been the determination of the Powers to open China to the trade of the world, and it is to be noted that in enforcing this determination they have never hesitated to invoke all the resources

of war as well as those of diplomacy. Up to 1834 the English, through the East India Company, had a virtual monopoly of the China trade, and the individual merchant, no matter what was his nationality, had but a poor chance. Trade was at first closely supervised by government and Company agents, but gradually outgrew their control. Outside merchants, especially Americans, forced their way into it, and this made trouble, which was followed by treaties and trade regulations. The English insisted upon having better facilities, and upon trading where they pleased, freely and without annoying restrictions, and especially upon the right to engage in the introduction and sale of opium, to the great injury, as the Chinese officials believed, of those who consumed it. The Chinese authorities resisted, and this led to the Opium War, followed soon after by the "Lorcha" War, in both of which they suffered great loss, humiliation, and defeat, and were finally compelled not only to legalize the opium trade, and pay their assailants a heavy subsidy in money, but in addition to limit themselves to the collection of an *ad valorem* duty of only five per cent. in silver on all goods imported from foreign countries. A few years later the allied French and English forces captured the Taku forts, and marched by Tientsin and Tunchow to the imperial capital, drove the Court across the borders, looted and destroyed the Summer Palace, levied tribute sufficient to pay the entire expenses of the war, and again showed the helpless Chinese that it was impossible for them to stand up against the "Foreign Devils."

During all these operations the diplomatic representatives of the United States, although always claiming their right under the doctrine of co-operation to share in the concessions made to their colleagues, maintained an attitude of neutrality, or sought by an independent show of friendship to gain some special advantages for our own country, while our naval commander looked on with complacency, till overcome by the thought that "Blood is thicker than water," when he set to work to rescue the British sailors, whose boats had been sunk by Chinese shot. It must be confessed that the conduct of our representatives throughout that period was rather that of the jackal than of the lion, and must have been extremely puzzling to the Chinese officials.

But when it comes to the action of individuals, the story is

much more creditable to Americans. Our missionaries, after the earlier Jesuits, were almost the first in that wide field. They were generally men of great piety and learning, like Morrison, Brown, Martin, and Williams, and did all in their power as genuine men of God to show the heathen that the stranger was not necessarily a public enemy, but might be an evangel of a higher and better civilization. These men and their co-laborers have established hospitals, schools, and colleges in various cities and provinces of the Empire, which are everywhere recognized by intelligent Chinamen as centres of unmitigated blessing to the people. Millions of dollars have been spent in this beneficent work, and the result is slowly but surely spreading the conviction that foreign arts and sciences are superior to "fung shuey" and native superstition.

So, too, the Americans have been leaders in commerce, and in fair and honest dealing with the Chinese. One of the oldest and most successful foreign houses ever founded in China was that of Russell & Company, which planted agencies in all the chief maritime cities, established steamboat lines on the principal rivers, and for nearly three-quarters of a century was known throughout the world for its enterprise and its widespread commercial transactions. Many other American houses of the highest character and scarcely less distinction have been planted in the open cities from Canton to New Chwang, until now it may be said that American products and manufactured goods are known throughout the Empire for their excellent quality, and that the value and extent of the commerce controlled by Americans are second only to that of Great Britain.

Americans have exerted extraordinary influence in another field, and at a time of vital importance to the reigning dynasty and its government. The Taiping rebellion, which ended in 1863, after incredible damage and devastation, was started and carried forward against the Manchus upon the idea of "China for the Chinese." It was based upon a sort of Mormon Christianity, and seemed in a fair way of overrunning the entire country till it was met by "the ever victorious army," organized and commanded by an American sailor named Ward. According to all disinterested accounts, this extraordinary man displayed genius and power of the highest order. Operating under the sanction of the Chinese Generalissimo, Li Hung Chang, he

gathered a force of Chinamen, not exceeding five thousand in all, whom he armed with foreign rifles, placed under foreign officers, and led in person against the rebels for two years of unbroken victory. Death alone at the head of his command put an end to his career. He was succeeded in turn by Burgevine, Forrester, and Gordon, two Americans and one Englishman, but neither of them changed the organization, or added to its invincible efficiency. Gordon, who finally laid down his life for Great Britain at Khartoum, it is true, rendered valuable services; but he was an erratic and uncertain man, and it is now generally admitted that had it not been for the work of Ward the rebellion would have been successful and the Manchu dynasty would have been expelled. The Chinese recognize the extraordinary character and influence of Ward's services at this critical epoch by the posthumous honors bestowed upon his memory, and by the stories of his courageous deeds which have spread broadcast among the people to the remotest corners of the Empire.

It was the good fortune of another American to point out the defenceless condition of China, her lack of an adequate army, the absence of a general staff and of a system of military transport and administration, nearly ten years before the Japanese invasion which ended in the utter humiliation of the Empire and has become the fruitful source of all the foreign troubles which now encompass it. How much greater the humiliation, and how much heavier the indemnity would have been, but for the sagacious counsel of a distinguished American statesman whom the Chinese had called in to assist them in their negotiations for peace, must remain for the present a matter of conjecture, although it is certain that the Japanese greatly moderated their demands in both money and territorial concessions after their terms were first submitted.

Other Americans in private life, as well as our able minister, *chargé d'affaires*, and consuls in China, have done much for the last twelve years, each in his proper sphere, to extend and strengthen the influence of the American name, till now it is safe to say that no power on earth stands so well or, independent of force, is so highly respected by the Chinese. In their aspirations for better government, and in their desire for railroads and the other appliances of a better civilization, there is every reason to believe that but for the intrigues and jealousies of the British,

French, German, and Russian diplomatists, promoters, and agents for the last decade, and especially since the close of the war with Japan, Americans would have been selected as experts to conduct and advise in all public works, and to furnish locomotives, rails, cars, machinery, and all sorts of supplies. No one knows better than the Chinese officials that the United States has no desire to despoil their country of its territorial possessions, nor to limit the sovereignty and independence of the Chinese government in any direction. But, unfortunately, the Chinese are like the rest of mankind, prone to withhold favors from their friends, in order to placate the enemies against whom they cannot defend themselves.

It has been suggested that perhaps the great powers have no intention of further dismembering the Chinese Empire, or of permanently occupying its territory and seaports, and this may be true. Nobody not in their confidence can be certain as to what may be their real policy and intentions, but it is an indisputable fact that so far no European power which has ever gained a footing in China has permanently or voluntarily relinquished it. It is certainly fair, therefore, to assume that they intend to hold on to what they have taken, and even to take more as opportunity offers. Russia cannot well help herself, for it seems to be the fate of a higher civilization and a stronger government to encroach upon a lower civilization and a weaker government whenever they come in close contact or have coterminous boundaries. Great Britain asserts authoritatively that she has no purpose of occupying Chinese territory or Chinese seaports, but that she intends merely to see that others do not, and that whatever privileges or extensions one power obtains shall be for the equal benefit of all. This is altruism on an imperial scale, and it must be confessed that of later years she has been fairly true to her free-trade principles, even in Asia, in her policy concerning ordinary commerce. But surely the United States would make a serious mistake if they should trust Great Britain or any other power to give their citizens a fair or even chance at any great business, such as assisting in the reorganization of government, or as contracting for railroads or for any other public works or supplies within the limits of conquered or annexed territory.

But on the general proposition as laid down by Mr. Balfour

in his late Manchester speech, and later by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, it is not to be denied that our interests are with our ancient antagonist, England, and for the first time against those of our ancient allies, France and Russia. How far we should go in an independent effort, or by open co-operation, or by an alliance expressed or implied, for safeguarding or extending these interests, is a matter for careful consideration.

As for France, her policy can hardly be in doubt. As before stated, she has seized and now holds the whole of Cochin-China, Tonquin, Anam, and a great part of Siam, and is credited with the purpose of raising her flag over Hainan at the first opportunity, and all this has been without a shadow of honest title. So far, her acts are simply acts of spoliation. Her statesmen and public journals make no disguise of their purpose to participate in what they euphemistically call the exploitation of China, and if a writer in a late number of the *Revue de Deux Mondes* can be credited with speaking the national sentiment, they will seek to draw their alliance closer with Russia for that purpose. The danger is that with the latter dominating at Peking and pressing forward from the north, the Japanese on the eastern coast, and France in the south, each eager to get a share of the spoils, and each distrusting the other, Great Britain, in spite of her benevolent declarations, may be compelled to abandon her good intentions and advance both from the frontier of Burmah in the west and from her base at Hong-Kong in the southeast to protect her vast commercial interests as well as to restrain the rapacity of rivals.

Notwithstanding the seizure of Kiao Chou Bay, the declarations of the Emperor in his speech at Kiel, the despatch of Prince Henry with reinforcements, and the later intelligence that the Chinese have conceded a lease of sovereignty over the bay and adjoining district, it is hardly possible that Germany is to be considered as a serious factor in the Chinese question. It is true that she is credited with having actively co-operated with Russia and France in breaking the victorious grasp of the Japanese after the close of the late war, and that she has not, up to a late date, received any adequate reward for her services. It is also true that she has been most active for some years in pushing her commercial interests in both Japan and China, but inasmuch as she has no colonial dependencies anywhere in

the Far East, and cannot yet be reckoned as a first-class naval power, it is difficult to perceive how she can hope to play any great part either in the regeneration of China, or in her dismemberment, if unhappily that should be her fate. In considering Germany's part in the game, it may help to understand her position if it is remembered that after the close of the Franco-Prussian war she succeeded in getting a call to assist in organizing military schools and in drilling the Chinese troops for the Viceroy Li Hung Chang; but the utter rout of the Chinese forces and the collapse of the Chinese military administration, in the effort to resist the Japanese invasion, was a great setback to German pretensions, and in the eyes of the Chinese an absolute "loss of face" to them.

If it should turn out, however, that there is to be no further dismemberment of China, and no concert of the powers for that purpose, but merely a general scramble for influence, contracts and trade, the base at Kiao Chou may serve the Germans a useful purpose, especially after it is connected with Peking and the other interior cities by rail. For the present it is badly situated for anything but a naval depot and rendezvous.

In considering the Far-Eastern question great embarrassment has been met with for lack of exact information as to the real purposes of the Powers. Collectively it is nearly certain that they have entered into no agreement and have no concerted policy for dismemberment or spoliation. It is known that Japan was permitted to go into the war with China without allies. The Powers, one and all, kept their hands off both belligerents. The United States alone tried to keep the peace, to protect Japanese subjects in China, and as opportunity offered to act as an intermediary after war had begun. When it was over and the terms of peace were agreed upon, Russia, supported by France and Germany, intervened to limit the Japanese occupation and finally to assist China in raising the money with which to pay the first instalment of the war indemnity, after Great Britain had been asked and declined to do it. But here all certainty ceases. There have been rumors from time to time, more or less circumstantial, of understandings between Russia and Japan, Russia and France, and last between Great Britain and Japan. And, strange as it may seem, it has even been reported that Lord Salisbury has instructed the British Ambassador to sound the government at Washington as

to the feasibility of a mutual understanding for the maintenance of China's autonomy. Finally, it is reported that the money for the last instalment of the Japanese war indemnity has been offered by the British government as the best means of restoring her lost *prestige* and strengthening the Chinese government, that this has brought the Russian government forward with new offers of assistance, and that the government at Peking is again resorting to the old game of playing one European power against the other.

If all this proves but little as to the real plans and purposes of the Powers, it makes it certain that the Far-Eastern question has reached an acute stage, full of danger for China as well as for all who really desire to see her saved from destruction and made strong enough to maintain her right of national existence against the world.

In any aspect of the case the interest of the United States in it cannot be regarded with indifference. Being, as they are, China's nearest neighbor across the sea, and the only one of the great powers which has absolutely no plans hostile to the peace, integrity, and general welfare of the Chinese people, they must look with the deepest apprehension upon the events taking place in that quarter. They cannot afford to be mistaken as to the plans of the other powers, nor to depend upon even the most benevolent of them for their proper share of the commerce now in existence, and which is sure to increase rapidly hereafter if China is permitted to work out her own salvation with her possessions intact and her autonomy unimpaired.

In considering the question of duty to our neighbors, and to our own great interests, it may be fairly assumed that the government at Washington will not forget that our territory not only abuts upon the sea abreast of China for two thousand miles, and almost incloses the whole of the North Pacific in the wide sweep of its shores and islands, but that our people having practically occupied the whole of their own vacant land, and exploited all its resources except those of its forests and mines, must necessarily turn their attention more and more to the commerce of the Pacific islands and of the countries beyond. To this end the annexation of Hawaii, which is freely offered to us, as a naval station and a halfway house, would seem to be fully justified. When it is remembered in addition that the extraordinary resources of the

country tributary to Puget Sound and Columbia River in timber, and to Portland and San Francisco in wheat and fruits, are sure to make those regions and their seaports the seat and centre of a great and ever-increasing commerce with the trans-Pacific countries, the importance of maintaining unbroken relations and extending our commerce with the latter can hardly be exaggerated. It is not to be denied that the American people have many questions of national and international importance to consider, and that hitherto scarcely a doubt has arisen as to the wisdom of confining their diplomacy to the cultivation of peaceful relations with all nations, entangling alliances with none ; but it is conceivable that circumstances may arise even in Asia, and a time may come when it will be the duty of our government not only to exert its own powers to their utmost, but, if need be, to accept even the co-operation of Great Britain if it can be obtained on proper terms, for the maintenance of our common interests beyond the Pacific.*

JAMES HARRISON WILSON.

* For a fuller discussion of "America's Opportunity in Asia," reference is made to the admirable article by CHARLES DENBY, JR., Secretary of the United States Legation at Peking, in the January number of this REVIEW. A more extended study of Chinese civilization and its possibilities may be found in *China, Travels and Investigations in the Middle Kingdom, etc.*, by General JAMES H. WILSON, D. Appleton & Co., Second Edition, 1894. J. H. W.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT.

BY FRANCES M. ABBOTT.

To argue either for or against woman suffrage would seem out of date at the present time. Everything that can be said theoretically on the subject has been said in so many ways, by persons of various degrees of culture and fairness of temper, that the topic has almost ceased to be included in the list of interesting debates. And yet the subject has staying qualities, as can be proved by the numbers of earnest advocates who cheerfully continue to besiege the State legislatures, and, what is more significant, the formation of anti-woman-suffrage societies among intelligent women.

I propose to treat the subject from the comparative point of view—that is, to consider its outcome in the light of the history of other reforms, and especially of those which relate to the status of women.

The arguments against woman suffrage, as I recall them, are, that it would be useless, expensive, detrimental to the best interests of women, inimical to marriage and otherwise destructive to the home; that women do not want it, that they are not mentally fitted for it, that it would impose upon them greater physical burdens than they could endure, that the polls are not fit places for women, that the female sex cannot perform military duty, that women are sufficiently represented as it is, that the ballot would brush the bloom of delicacy from the female temperament, that it would be subversive of the best interests of the Republic, that it is against nature.

Incidentally, it has been stated, and these indirect reproaches often have more weight than arguments, that many of the foremost advocates of the cause are not beautiful, that they are care-

less in dress, that they are old maids, that they are not church members, that they do not eat ice-cream with forks, that they are cranks, and, generally speaking, poor, unfashionable and unpopular.

I cannot see the permanent value of any of these arguments, because every one of them has been urged with equal force against the entrance of women into medicine and against the admission of women to college. It is the same with the innuendoes. It does not require a very long memory to recall when every one of the reproaches was applied to the first women physicians and to the first women graduates. Even now we occasionally hear these reproaches, because people rarely separate the cause from the coincidence.

I cannot see why suffrage for woman is not in line with every other change in her opportunities that has occurred during the last half century. I make this statement simply as a historical student. It is difficult to fix the beginnings of movements, because there are always sporadic instances before the general tendency becomes marked, but the last fifty years may be said to cover the most striking changes in woman's advance as a human being. The first Woman's Rights Convention was called in July, 1848. The subject had been occasionally discussed before, but I believe this date marks the beginning of the concerted agitation. Associated with the demands for the ballot made by this convention were demands for industrial opportunities for women, changes in the laws relating to the holding of property by wives, admission to the medical and other professions, advanced education, and general independence of thought and action. These changes have nearly all been made in precisely the order in which they were most needed. Theoretically the ballot ought to have come first, but practically it can wait till the last.

The most imperative demand is the bread-and-butter one; hence the industrial opportunities were first opened. Women had been elementary teachers and dressmakers during Colonial times, because these occupations were carried on largely under the protection of the home, and did not greatly differ from tending children and spinning and weaving under the family roof-tree. The establishment of the factory system may be said to mark woman's entrance into general industrial life. Driven by the lack of ready money in rural communities to seek sustenance

elsewhere, the farmers' daughters sought employment in factories some years before Mrs. Stanton and Lucretia Mott signed the call for the first convention. But the factories, good as they were, supplied relief only to a small and special class. The majority of adult women were married, and the atrocious pecuniary subjection in which they were held by the old English common law could not fail to secure statutory relief in a time when the whole country was torn by anti-slavery discussion and other demands for individual rights. Statutes in relation to property-holding by married women were enacted as early as 1848, and these changes have continued to the present decade till in some States the laws are even more favorable to women than to men.

The need for women in the medical profession was so apparent that they gained entrance there long before they engaged in journalism, law, the ministry or architecture. I am making a general statement and not considering individual or exceptional cases. The usefulness of the woman physician to the community seemed rather more direct than the usefulness of the college woman, whose education was presumably gained for self-culture; hence the medical diploma anteceded the diploma of liberal arts. Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell received her degree in 1849, and the first college for the liberal education of women was opened in 1865. We must remember, however, that only a few hundred women physicians were graduated before 1865, and that the higher education for women was not unknown before Vassar opened its doors. Still I think it may be fair to say that the special professional training as a movement antedated the general culture.

During and after the upheaval of the Civil War new avenues rapidly opened. Women entered the government service as clerks. They became bookkeepers in stores where they formerly had been only saleswomen. And so gradually, until the invention of the typewriter; and then, with a sudden rush, women have become clerks, secretaries, and assistants in every department of mercantile life, in railroad, newspaper, and professional offices, in banks, post-offices, and state departments. Positions requiring greater general culture, like advanced educational and library work, have been secured at a more recent date.

Increased independence in thought and action has been going on all the while. When women began to speak in the early anti-

slavery meetings, they were hooted at, not only because the opinions they uttered were considered fanatical, but because it was such an indecent thing for women to speak in public at all. We have changed all that, and the decline of the popular lecture and the rise of the special lecture before small audiences will undoubtedly make public speaking by women even more common than it is now. The church is the stronghold of conservatism, but there are few religious meetings now where the voice of woman is not heard. The marvellous growth of club life is bringing to the front those who thought they never, never could do such things. It may be well to remind some of the women who are now joining clubs as a fashionable fad that the pioneer clubs, Sorosis of New York, and the Woman's Club of Boston, both established thirty years ago, never could have existed, if their founders had not been willing to brave sneers, caricatures, and the cold shoulder of society. We do not hear the epithet "strong-minded" in these days, but the early club members were nothing else. Alice Cary was put forward as the first President of Sorosis, because, although a suffragist, it was rightly felt that her personality and influence would help to counteract the ridicule which the "unfeminine" movement was sure to meet.

The invention of the electric light has made the streets of our cities safe for women at midnight. The interest in athletics and all kinds of outdoor amusements is evolving a rational dress for women. Except for a few absurdities, for which fashion is responsible, such as the high, starched collar on the shirt waist, and the long skirt worn on the street, which the bicycle bids fair to render obsolete, the dress of women to-day is healthful. I stood not long ago on the campus of a woman's college, which has never been considered lacking in conservatism, and saw the girls play basketball in bloomers and sweaters. I could not help thinking of the days of their grandmothers, when loose skirts, pantalets, and slippers were considered the suitable attire for modest maidens, and every kind of physical exercise was denied them. I need not have gone so far for a radical change in public opinion. The alumnae of only ten years' standing were mourning because the college in their day supplied nothing better than boarding-school calisthenics.

I cannot conceive of anything that women could do in the future that would shock the public now as the things they actu-

ally are doing would have shocked the public of thirty, twenty, or even ten years ago. Women attend the business meetings of corporations, and in some cases, notably small manufacturing or business concerns, if they have a large amount of money invested, they serve as directors, even as presidents and treasurers. They vote on school matters in the majority of the States. They have full suffrage in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and Idaho and municipal suffrage in Kansas. Even in States where they do not vote, women are frequently seen at the polls, notably members of the W. C. T. U., who go for the purpose of distributing ballots or providing coffee in the interests of temperance.

We see the same changes in social life. Years ago a man's club was the one spot where a woman could not set her foot. It was generally supposed that the moral tone of the place was such that she would not wish to go there if she could. Customs have changed so much that women not only visit the club on "ladies' nights," but they are actually invited to the restaurant on ordinary days. Almost all the newer clubs, especially those in the country and those connected with athletic interests, make provision for women, and in some cases the club suppers are almost as domestic as family parties. Last winter I attended a meeting of a woman's society at a man's club in one of our great cities. The club men were not invited to the meeting, but the courtesy of a portion of their house was extended for the day, because the society was a noted one and the club could offer finer accommodations than any hotel. Some of the ladies, when enjoying the perfect appointments of the dressing and dining rooms, remarked that it was a pity that women should ever undertake housekeeping when men had shown that they could do it so much better.

The great obstacle to woman suffrage, acknowledged by its friends and foes, is that the majority of women do not want it; and this majority, with seeming inconsistency, seems to be as large among thinking women as among the unthinking. But I do not regard this obstacle as insuperable, for an illogical state of affairs cannot endure forever. That subtle, elusive force known as public opinion is subject to the most sudden changes, and no one can ever tell how small a thing may start it. Sometimes a mechanical invention puts an entirely new phase upon a subject which has been argued about for years. Gail Hamilton was not

altogether wrong when she said that the man who first made rubber boots for woman had done more for her advancement than all the agitators, male and female, who had ever spoken on the subject. And yet the agitators have their place. They are always extremists, people of one idea, who lash public opinion until it bestirs itself. Garrison was undoubtedly a fanatic, even an anarchist, but his statue stands to-day on the most fashionable avenue of the city through whose streets he was once dragged with a halter about his neck.

The advocates of woman suffrage can afford to be dignified at this stage. So much of what they asked, conjointly with the ballot, has been granted that the latter seems only a question of time. The other things came first because the need of them was more apparent. The advantages of the ballot for women have probably been greatly overestimated, just as the advantages of the ballot for men have. It is the way with all panaceas. Sidney Smith, ever witty, never said a wiser thing than when speaking of the Great Reform Bill in 1831: "There will be mistakes at first, as there are in all changes. Young ladies will imagine, as soon as this bill is carried, that they will be instantly married, school-boys believe that gerunds and supines will be abolished, and that currant tarts must ultimately come down in price; the corporal and sergeant are sure of double pay; bad poets will expect a demand for their epics; fools will be disappointed, as they always are; reasonable men, who know what to expect, will find that a very serious good has been obtained."

We always expect too startling changes after an innovation, particularly if it is one to which we are opposed. I saw but a few months ago a fling in a magazine because the admission of women to medicine had produced no great specialist who had made the theory or practice very different from what they were before; also a sneer, because no towering genius had appeared among the thousands of college-bred women. But not even the writer of this article would deny that the world is somewhat different to-day because of the women physicians and the women graduates. We do not want the great specialists or the towering geniuses nearly so much as we need the quiet, faithful work of numbers of apparently commonplace people who are insensibly moulding society to better ways.

The progress of school suffrage for women is an example of

what we might reasonably expect from political suffrage. In my own State, women have voted on school matters for about twenty years, and as no tax is required, the system has had a fair chance. If I were asked what great benefits had accrued I could not honestly say that gerunds and supines had been abolished, but in regard to the currant tarts, there might be a question. The tarts may not have come down in price, but their making and other forms of cooking have been introduced into the schools, so that the tarts are more abundant than formerly. All the young women have not got married, but a goodly number of them, whether married or not, vote on the school question.

The progress of events was something like this in a representative city. At the first election only one or two women were present, and these were pronounced advocates of woman's voting. As time went by, the number slowly increased; many women thought they ought to vote, but did not quite dare, they had been taught from their childhood that it was so improper. Finally, a question came up which seemed to involve a moral principle. The town was canvassed, and women as well as men appeared in great numbers. The good won. Since then matters have settled down, and women now vote as a matter of course. If you should go to the polls at an election, you would meet precisely the same class of women there that you would see at an afternoon tea. The number of male and female voters is about equal. The total number, when no exciting question is up, is small compared with the total adult population, because most people believe in letting well enough alone; and when there are no complaints, the same members of the board of education are allowed to serve till they die or resign.

It is difficult to say just what progress is due to the women voters, because all events are intertwined. The election of women as members of the board, which has been a pronounced good, probably would not have occurred had not women first voted. Rare instances might be found, in the small villages of the State, where women held office before they had school suffrage, but the custom of electing women as members of the school committee, which is now general throughout the State, did not obtain till suffrage was granted. It is interesting to note that it was not the votes of women that elected the women, for I have

never known an instance of a woman's ticket running in opposition to a man's ticket. The election of women came about because of the gradual change in public opinion after the granting of suffrage. When women could vote, and did vote, it was absurd to say that they should not hold office; and, as fast as suitable candidates were presented, men and women voted for them as a matter of course. This is a point worth noting by the anti-suffragists, for some of them seem to think that in politics a majority of women would be on one side of every question and a majority of men on the other; and, if the women could not defend their victories by military force, there would be an end to the Republic.

Many changes have come about in the schools since women voted, such as the introduction of cooking, sewing, and manual training beside great improvements in the sanitary arrangements; but these may be partly due to the progress of the times. I am certain that the suffrage of women has had one effect. It would be impossible now to elect a candidate whose character was considered unfit for office, though such candidates have occasionally served in previous times.

At present the woman suffrage question seems in a fair way to solve itself without much help from anyone. The fact that suffrage has actually been secured in some portions of the West, and that the sun still rises and sets on those domains as of yore, shows that the movement is very likely to spread, especially as other portions of the country have become accustomed to seeing some form of woman's voting. Women at present do not want political suffrage, but some crisis might arise when they would want it very much, and then there would be a land-slide of public opinion. They do not want it now because they were not brought up that way; they do not approve of it; they do not think it nice. Such sentiments form the bulwark of conservatism in regard to our manners and customs; but people not yet beyond middle age have seen changes enough in these very manners and customs to make the Sphinx smile.

The bicycle is a case in point. A dozen years ago, when the machine had unequal wheels, one the size of a centre table and the other the size of a dinner plate, only men rode. There were probably many daring misses who wished they could emulate their brothers, and surreptitiously tried to learn. I knew of one girl

who broke her arm in an attempt of this sort. The matter was hushed up as much as possible on account of the extreme mortification of the family, but the result was privately spoken of as an awful example to young girls of conduct unseemly for their sex.

We know the result of the invention of the safety bicycle; but even this result was not instantaneous. Only nine years ago I was with a party at a mountain resort, and one of the ladies said that she was intending to get a bicycle. "You mean a tricycle, I suppose," politely said a gentleman. "No, a bicycle," was the reply, and the suppressed astonishment of the company could be felt. Even three years ago I knew many ladies who spoke in this wise: "Of course, I know there are respectable women who ride, and it is very well for working-girls, who have no other means of recreation, but I never should wish to see my daughter doing anything of the sort." The indescribable aloofness conveyed in the tone of voice was something like that I heard ten years before when a young woman was about to enter college. "Going to college?" was the unsympathetic comment, as if the person lived in another world. "Oh, fitting yourself for a teacher, I suppose?"

I have lived to see the woman who never wished her daughter to have a bicycle ride a wheel herself in company with that daughter; and when I ventured to recall her former opinions she said, with unblushing serenity: "Oh, well, everybody rides now; the most fashionable people have taken it up; there is really nothing like it," and she began to chide me because I did not own a wheel. The bishop who thought it was not necessary for women to go to college unless they expected to become teachers has united his sons in marriage to college women. The woman who thought that female physicians might do well enough in simple cases, but that they never could be really successful, because in time of peril you would always call in a man, you know, is now spending her property to graduate her daughter from a medical college. If I should say anything to any of these people about their embracing what they so recently despised, they would reply in the language of the bicycle woman: "Oh, well, everybody does it now; the most fashionable people have taken it up; there is really nothing like it."

I sometimes think that inconsistency is the most prominent

characteristic of human nature, but the most delightful example I ever knew is the action of the anti-woman-suffragists, who are petitioning legislatures, appearing before committees of men, taking part in politics, and, in brief, doing precisely the things that they beg they shall never be allowed to do. The "antis" are really gaining considerable strength among the better classes in some of the cities, and this is to me the most marked sign that woman suffrage may be nearer than we think.

I have not yet attained great age, but the world has turned around many times since I became a passenger on this planet. People who occupied front rows in the seats of the scornful and perked up their noses in disdain at the lowly have gone down on their knees to what they once considered a worm in the dust. I may not live beyond the allotted age of man, but I firmly expect before I die that some of those who now sneer at woman's rights, woman's suffrage, and the like, will come around to solicit me to subscribe for a statue to Amelia Bloomer or a monument to Susan B. Anthony.

FRANCES M. ABBOTT.

EUROPEAN EXAMPLE FOR AMERICAN FARMERS.

BY A. F. WEBER.

WITH the sudden and unexpected prosperity that has come to the agricultural interests of the United States in the last few months, there is a tendency in some quarters to forget the lessons of the presidential campaign of 1896. The farmer was crying for more money. Good crops and equally good prices have brought him more money ; *ergo*, the farmer's woes are now past history. Such a course of reasoning, which is very prevalent in the East at this writing, entirely overlooks the real grievance of the farmers of the South and West. However inadequately analyzed and expressed by the farmers themselves, their grievance is real and deep-seated, and it behooves the statesmen and economists of the country to find a remedy. The free silver panacea is being abandoned by many Western leaders, although it may reappear with altered conditions in the production of the two money metals. But in giving up the free coinage idea, leading Populists like ex-Senator Peffer have merely changed their allegiance to fiat paper money. They will not cease advocating some dangerous remedy like this, until they are provided, not with more *money*, but with adequate facilities of *credit*. The Hon. Hoke Smith, ex-Secretary of the Interior, expressed a substantial truth when he said that "the people, especially in the rural districts, have a just grievance. It is due, in large part, to the narrowness of our national banking system. With the limitations now placed upon this system, no facilities are afforded to the agricultural classes for short loans upon their real estate, so much needed during planting and harvesting seasons each year. In our section they would have willingly accepted even a conditional repeal of the tax upon State banks as a substitute for free coinage of silver."

Mr. Smith's remedy for the farmer's grievance is banking reform. That extensive reforms in our national banking system are imperatively needed few economists deny. Whether any change that *might* be made would provide credit facilities in the localities where it is most needed is one question; whether any changes that *will* be made will provide such facilities is another question. At any rate, the American people are in an attitude where they will welcome help from other quarters than legislation. Projects of self-help appeal to one of the deepest traits of the American character, and from this point of view a discussion of the agricultural credit system of Germany ought to prove valuable.

On what occasions and for what purposes does the farmer need to borrow money? On the answer to this question depends the kind of credit best adapted to his needs. If he wishes to pay for his farm, which he has inherited with incumbrances or bought with a small cash payment, he needs to borrow money at a comparatively low rate of interest and for a long term of years. A loan that can be called in at short notice may, in a time of crisis or depression, seriously embarrass or even ruin him. It is also desirable that his payments should not only cover the interest on the loan, but also contribute toward the liquidation of the principal itself. An addition to the rate of interest of one-half of one per cent. annually will pay off the entire debt in about fifty-six years; an addition of one per cent. in about forty-one years. A mortgage on the property at a valuation of, say, fifty to sixty per cent. should afford the lender ample security. But all experience has shown that the three essential requirements of cheapness, long terms, and amortization payments are not adequately secured by a system of free competition among individual capitalists. The stumbling-block is the security offered. Only the large landowner can obtain money readily on real estate security. For it takes time to investigate titles and go through with other little formalities. Expert knowledge and familiarity with local conditions are also needed to set correct valuations upon the real estate. And if the debtor fails to pay, the process of obtaining redress, or possession of the land, is usually troublesome and expensive. The consequence of all these obstacles is to raise the terms upon which money can be borrowed on mortgage. Some organization of credit is therefore required, and in Germany three

forms of organization have been developed: (1.) by the State or one of its sub-divisions; (2.) by the lenders; (3.) by the borrowers. Let us consider each of these, briefly, in turn.

Advances to citizens out of State funds, or by means of government banks, may be dismissed with a word as being antagonistic to the spirit of our government. There exists no good reason why, if advances are made to one industry, they should not be made to all, and nobody proposes that the government should adopt such paternalism. The experience of England in borrowing money and then loaning it to the Irish peasants to be repaid by an annuity of 5 per cent. has resulted disastrously. Owing to the fall in prices, the Irish have been unable to keep up their annuities, and the government faces the prospect of having to make its debtors a present of the money advanced to assist them in becoming proprietors, or else foreclose its mortgages and become the universal landlord. In Germany the public institutions of agricultural credit—the *Landeskreditkassen*—have been developed chiefly outside of Prussia, in which private institutions have met the needs of the farmers. The earliest *Kasse* was the ducal *Leihhaus* of Brunswick, founded in 1765. There are now about a dozen of these institutions in the smaller states of central and northwestern Germany. Their loans at the end of 1889 amounted to 433,879,540 marks (about \$109,000,000).*

Very recently another public credit institution has been developed in Saxony, Bavaria, Hessen, etc., the *Landeskulturrentenbank*, which is designed exclusively to promote agricultural improvements, such as drainage and irrigation. In Prussia it has had even less success than the *Landeskreditkasse*. Its loans in 1890 amounted to 15,345,939 marks in Saxony,† and perhaps to 20,000,000 marks (\$5,000,000) in all Germany.

Of the private credit organizations there are two distinct classes, associations of lenders and those of borrowers. They agree only in this important feature, that they interpose the credit of an association between borrower and lender. The company creates negotiable obligations which find a ready sale among investors, and the proceeds are advanced to farmers on mortgage. Those who buy bonds look for the payment of their interest only to the association, which takes upon itself all questions of title

* Conrad's *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, Vol. IV., p. 922.

† Op. cit., IV., 926.

and security. The borrowers deal only with the association. The most famous company of lenders is the *Crédit Foncier* of France, founded in 1852, eighty years after the system had been introduced in Prussia by the formation of a union of borrowers. Associations of lenders are comparatively new in Germany, dating mostly from the period 1862-73. They are known as *Hypothekenaktien banken*, or mortgage corporations, and in 1890 had out mortgage loans amounting to more than \$750,000,000,* two-thirds of which is on city real estate. But their operations differ little from those of American mortgage and trust companies; indeed, there was incorporated in New York only a few months ago a very large financial company whose methods follow very closely those of the *Crédit Foncier*.

Of more importance to the farmers than these companies of capitalists are co-operative associations of their own, like the successful German *Landschaften*, or provincial societies. They consist of the landowners of a single county or province associated for the purpose of borrowing money on their *collective* credit. When a member declares his wish to borrow a sum of money, the association issues its bonds (*Pfandbriefe*) for a certain percentage (usually one-half) of the valuation of the borrower's property, sells the bonds to investors and advances the money to the petitioner, taking as its security a mortgage on the property. The idea of thus substituting the joint guarantee of all the proprietors for that of individuals, and establishing a book in which this land stock should be registered and be transferable, and the dividends paid exactly in the same way as the public funds, originated with Büding, a Berlin merchant, and was put into effect by Frederick the Great by the foundation of the Silesian *Landschaft* in 1770 (MacLeod). Since then a *Landschaft* has been established in nearly every other province of Prussia and in several other German states as well. Indeed, the system has spread to other countries like Austria, Denmark, Russia (Poland), etc., and, as we have already seen, the fundamental idea was embodied in the *Crédit Foncier* by Napoleon III. and Wolowski, both of whom had studied the German *Landschaften*.

The advantages of this system of agricultural credit must be obvious on the slightest reflection. It unites the security of a mortgage with the advantages of negotiable paper. It is the only

*Op. cit., IV., 509.

system that identifies in one person both creditor and debtor. As a borrower the individual member secures the advantages of low rates of interest, long terms, and sinking fund contribution mentioned in a preceding paragraph. But as a member of a company of lenders, the same individual will exercise the strictest caution in evaluating the property which a fellow-member offers as a security for a loan. The smaller the association the better acquaintance will each member have with the value of other members' property. On the other hand, a small association will be less able to withstand unforeseen financial trouble, and its bonds will be held in less esteem on the great exchanges. But by a union of several small associations the advantages of perfect security on the one side, and of financial strength and independence on the other, will be secured. Such a union was effected in 1873 by eight of the Prussian *Landschaften*, thus perfecting a system that had existed in parts for over a hundred years, achieved constant success, and continually widened its sphere of influence. "Their obligations have maintained through all crises—monetary, war, and revolutionary—a steadiness of value far beyond any other public securities whatever, either governmental or commercial." In 1848, when all public securities fell, the *Pfandbriefe* kept their value better than anything else. The Prussian funds fell to 69, the shares of the Bank of Prussia to 63, and the railway shares to 30 to 90 per cent., whereas the land credit bonds, producing $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest, in Silesia and Pomerania stood at 93, in West Prussia at 83, and in East Prussia at 96 (Macleod). It is needless to say that the *Landschaften* are subject to government supervision—although this is probably no stricter than that over our national banks. There seems no good reason why the system should not yield equally good results in the United States, where the union of borrower and lender in one person has been successfully accomplished already by means of building and loan associations.*

The institutions that we have thus far been discussing are designed to furnish long-time loans on real estate security. While very excellent in their way, they do not pretend to meet every legitimate need of the farmer. Many farmers have no property to mortgage, being only tenants; yet they need capital to buy

* Ten years ago the loans of the seventeen Prussian *Landschaften* amounted to over \$400,000,000, practically all being agricultural credit.

seed, tools, fertilizers, and pay wages for help during the period between seed time and harvest. Many other farmers own property already covered with incumbrances. This is particularly the case in the West and South. And in those regions banking facilities are so utterly inadequate that borrowing on personal security is either impossible or possible only at exorbitant rates. The greatest sufferers are probably the cotton growers of the Southern States, whose only form of short-time credit is what is known as "crop liens." Since the war the local merchant, who has superseded the large cotton factor of the ports as buyer and shipper of cotton, is the only capitalist from whom the small farmers can obtain the advances necessary to carry on agricultural operations and the means of subsistence during the raising of the crop. This system of credit is thus described by Mr. M. B. Hammond, in an article on the "Southern Farmer and Cotton" in the *Political Science Quarterly* for September.

The credit which he [the merchant] furnishes is seldom given in the form of money loans, and there are nominally no interest charges made for his advances. These usually consist of provisions, especially corn and bacon, tools, farm animals, fertilizers, cotton ties and bagging, household utensils—in fact, everything the farmer has to buy. They are almost invariably bought 'on time,' to be paid for when the crop is harvested and sold. As security for his advances the merchant secures from the farmer at the beginning of the crop season a 'crop lien,' or chattel mortgage, which is duly attested and recorded at the office of the county recorder, or judge of probate. This binds the farmer to deliver to the merchant, as soon as harvested, the crops of cotton, corn, etc., or enough of them to pay the merchant at the ruling market price of this produce for all the advances which the farmer has obtained during the raising of the crop.

"In spite of the control over the debtor which the crop-lien system gives the merchant, the risk which he runs, with the losses which he actually suffers as a result of conducting business on such a basis, necessitates extremely high prices for all merchandise sold in this way. Most advancing merchants have two schedules of prices—one for purchasers who buy for cash, the other for 'time' purchasers. Prices on a credit schedule are usually from 20 to 50 per cent. higher than those on a cash schedule. Thus, flour selling at four dollars per barrel to cash buyers sells for five dollars on a credit basis; bacon selling at ten cents a pound cash, for twelve and a half cents 'on time'; calico selling at five cents a yard cash, for seven cents, etc. As the average length of time which these debts run before payment is not more than six months, the difference between cash and credit prices is equivalent to an annual interest charge of from 40 to 100 per cent.

"The extent to which this credit system prevails varies, of course, with localities. . . . To say that three-fourths of the cotton-growers are in this sort of dependence on the advancing merchants or factors would not be an extravagant estimate."

With this authoritative statement before us, it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of making far-reaching reforms in our credit system. That the demand for free coinage, paper currency—anything that will give “more money”—will continue, cannot be doubted. But the wisest Southern statesmen realize that it is not more money so much as better credit facilities that are needed in the South. Certainly no Southern statesman since the war has made upon the Northern people a deeper impression of profound insight and clear reasoning than the late Henry W. Grady, and it was sixteen years ago that Mr. Grady, speaking of the tendency of the plantations of the merchant lenders to swallow up the little farms of debtors, maintained that “the remedy for this deplorable situation is, first of all, the establishment of a proper system of credit.”*

Now it was to meet almost precisely similar conditions that the Germans, a half century ago, developed the co-operative credit societies, which have spread all over the continent of Europe. Is it not time that Americans should at least investigate their merits?

These loan associations are of two kinds, the *Kreditgenossenschaften*, founded by Schulze-Delitzsch, and the *Darlehnskassenvereine*, by Raffeisen. The fundamental idea of both is that of the *Landschaften*, namely, that a “body of men, many of whom expect to become borrowers, should furnish the capital and regulate the conditions of its lending and repayment.” Small farmers find it difficult to obtain money advances, because they seek small amounts and cannot furnish the usual security. But while a single farmer finds it impossible to secure a loan of \$100, ten farmers can without trouble secure \$1,000, provided each pledges his property for all, and all stand together for each. Co-operative banking has been called the democratizing of credit; it aims to make every man capable of securing credit who is worthy of credit. In 1850, when the first of these societies was organized at Delitzsch, it had to charge its members 14½ per cent. on loans, which was a low rate in comparison with that which they had been paying. To-day the average rate of interest in the societies is 5½ per cent.†

Although the main object of both the Schulze and the Raf-

* *Harper's Magazine*, LXIII., 719.

† *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, vol. IV., p. 881.

feisen associations is the same—namely, by collecting a small capital to secure credit with investors and then make loans to members after a direct personal examination of the circumstances of the borrower—there are certain differences in management, method of making loans, etc., that call for attention.

The co-operative loan associations founded by Schulze, of Delitzsch, in 1850, are composed of workers in all professions and occupations, industry as well as agriculture. And this feature is regarded by the advocates of the system as one essential to its strength. At one time money will be abundant in one industry and “tight” in another, and a *general* association equalizes the supply. If the association were composed of farmers alone, it is said that they would all need credit at the same season, and many would have to be disappointed. In the second place, the loans of the Schulze societies are for a short period only, being as a rule for three months. Thirdly, the Schulze system lays stress on regular contributions and the acquirement of shares, much as do the building and loan associations of this country. Both are also alike in distributing profits among the members, or shareholders. Fourthly, the Schulze societies are more or less centralized and are managed by salaried officials.

This brief description of the principal features of the Schulze *Kreditgenossenschaften* will suffice to indicate how closely they approximate to the organization of regular banking establishments. Their business is virtually the same—making loans on personal security, discounting bills, and keeping accounts current. In fact, it might be said that the only distinction between the co-operative loan association and the bank lies in the proportion of borrowers among shareholders. If the loan association cares to utilize its opportunities, it can lend money to large capitalists (non-members) on better terms than it can secure from its own members. In that way it will increase the dividends of its members, and so the temptation is strong to enter into competition with the banks. But the “hunt for dividends” destroys the co-operative character of credit societies, for it raises the rate of interest to a height which prevents the members themselves from borrowing.*

* In the American building and loan associations about one-fourth of the members are borrowers. But the bidding for loans carries the rate so high that the real gainers are the investors who do not borrow. In this light the associations take on the character of savings rather than credit institutions.

In favor of the policy of dividing profits is urged its encouragement of saving among the members. The friends of the Schulze system, moreover, maintain that such societies as have joined the "chase for profits" are exceptions and "that the most important societies, whose business amounts to hundreds of millions, take particular pride in not denying their humble origin and in offering the same facilities to the smallest patron that they grant to a customer whose business is worth thousands of dollars."* The power of cooperative associations to transform themselves into purely banking corporations has been greatly curtailed by the enactment of a law in 1889 forbidding them to make loans to non-members.

While the Schulze societies have on the whole attained eminent success, there has been considerable complaint in Germany that they did not fully meet the needs of agriculturists, and the last quarter-century has seen the rapid development of the Raffeisen co-operative credit societies (*Darlehnkassenvereine*) among the farmers. The first society founded by Raffeisen in 1849 was not strictly a credit institution and did not become so until 1864. The second society was founded in 1872, and it is since that date that the idea has taken root in Germany. It has been held in favor by the governments, which have granted numerous subsidies to new societies. In 1890 there were over 1,000 associations.

While the objects of the Schulze societies are largely commercial, the Raffeisen associations emphasize their ethical purpose as well. Not only do they furnish credit to their members, but they encourage the organization of auxiliary co-operative societies for the purchase of fertilizers, tools, cattle, and means of subsistence, for the common use of expensive machinery, and for the sale of farm products. They do not make loans to every one who can furnish security unless they find him morally and intellectually worthy of help. Members must borrow only for a specific purpose, and as they are under the eyes of their colleagues, if the money is misapplied it can be promptly called in. So close an acquaintance with borrowers and so strict a control over the use made of loans, it is asserted, cannot be accomplished with the large, varied, and fluctuating membership of the Schulze associations. Hence, the first principle laid down by Raffeisen

**Handb. der Staatswissenschaften*, IV., 882.

was that the membership must be limited to men following a single pursuit and restricted to as narrow an area as possible. One society to a district containing an average population of 1,500 should be the ideal. The members must as far as possible be persons living under similar conditions, animated by a common spirit in both industrial and social relations, and capable of a fellow-feeling with each other's necessities.

The management under these conditions is comparatively simple, being in the hands of a directorate controlled by a council. General rules regarding, for example, the maximum credit to be granted, are promulgated by a general assembly of all members, which also elects the officers. The officials all serve without salary, with the exception of an accountant, who examines the books every four years. It is believed that such an administration will be without motives to enlarge the business of the society at the expense of members who wish to borrow at a low rate.

A further provision against the danger of transformation into regular banks is the prohibition of dividends; surplus money is added to the reserve fund, which secures the independence of the association from the "money market," and furnishes means to further distributive co-operation in agriculture, and otherwise promote the common welfare of the members. The absence of dividends removes the temptation to secure large returns by catering to outsiders and neglecting members, or by creating within the association an artificial distinction between borrowers and investors (non-borrowers)—a distinction that may obliterate the ethical significance of the movement. The Raffeißen supporters regard the enactment of the law of 1889 forbidding co-operative societies to lend to non-members as a victory for one of their fundamental principles.

Dr. Raffeißen at first repudiated the share system, on the ground that farmers could not easily make regular contributions. Experience proved the difficulty of carrying on the association on any other basis, and the law of co-operation of 1889 prescribed some form of the share system. Every member of the Raffeißen societies must now take one share (about \$6), payable by installments; but no member may possess more than one share. Thus the shares constitute but a small proportion of the total capital, and remove the temptation to do a banking business.

The last point in which the Raffeisen societies differ from the Schulze societies is the termination of loans. Instead of giving the short three months term with possible renewals, Dr. Raffeisen, feeling that the farmers needed a longer term, provided that loans might be made for a period of from one to ten years (the usual term is one to two years). But in order to provide for sudden emergencies, it is stipulated that the association may withdraw loans on four weeks' notice. This is, perhaps, the weakest point in the Raffeisen system and has been subjected to a good deal of criticism.

The principal differences of the two systems have now been described. In other respects they pursue nearly identical methods. In both, admission is practically free to every man without regard to financial standing. In both the principle of unlimited liability generally prevails, although since 1889 it is no longer universal.* The associations of von Broich, with limited liability, have been anything but successful, not being able to procure the necessary capital. Dr. Crüger, a leading authority, regards it as probable that in the future loan associations not possessing any very large capital will be organized on the basis of unlimited liability, unless local circumstances determine them to adopt the contrary principle.†

Both associations have a central organization. Many of the Schulze societies belong to the General Association of German Co-operative Societies (*Allgemeine Verband Deutscher Erwerbs- und Wirthschaftsgenossenschaften*‡) which in 1890 consisted of 1,072 credit societies, 262 distribution societies (*Konsumvereine*), and 56 other co-operative societies. Yearly reports are published by the secretary, and yearly meetings are attended by representatives from all parts of the country.

The Raffeisen societies are bound together by three distinct central organizations.§ First, there is the Central Agricultural Bank, designed to equalize the surpluses and deficiencies of the money supply in the local societies, which are the shareholders of the bank. Secondly, there is a General Agency of the Agricultural Co-operative Societies of Germany,|| intended to represent

* May 31, 1891, out of the 3,910 credit and loan associations reported, only 146 were based on the principle of limited liability. See *Hdwbh. der Staatswissenschaften*, IV., 881.

† Op. cit., IV., 881.

‡ Op. cit., III., 316.

§ Cf. op. cit., II., 907.

|| *Generalanwaltschaftsverband ländlicher Genossenschaften für Deutschland*.

the societies in parliament and before the courts ; to support the local societies and extend the system by founding new ones, and to supervise the solvency of the societies. Dr. Raffeyen was the General Secretary until his death in 1888, when his son succeeded him. Thirdly, the firm of Raffeyen & Co. was established as a means of supplementing the funds of societies and rendering them independent of the government subsidies. The firm manages the general printing office as well as a savings bank and life insurance company, and publishes the *Co-operative News* (*Genossenschaftsblatt*). These organizations represent the societies of Western Germany and have their seat at Neuwied on the Rhine. The local societies in Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, Hanover, Silesia, etc., have independent general associations.

The growth of credit and loan associations in Germany has been very rapid in recent years. In 1892 the number known to exist was 4,791. The following statistics of the Schulze societies that reported to the central bureau in 1890 will show the extent of their operations: Number of societies reporting, 1,072; number of members, 518,003; funds derived from contributions of members, \$29,270,000; reserve fund, \$7,119,000; funds from other sources, \$123,456,500; advances, including renewals, \$410,393,500; expended for educational purposes, \$10,147. What proportion of the activity benefits the farmers it is impossible to determine. In 1888, however, out of a reported membership of 411,676, only 123,833, or 30 per cent., were connected with agriculture. The associations greatly assist the farmer, but their principal service is rendered to artisans and town-dwellers.

The statistics of the Raffeyen societies are very imperfect. We know only that in 1891 the Neuwied Association embraced 735 local societies with a membership of 70,000, and did business to the extent of seven and a half million dollars.

Both forms of credit co-operation have been adopted in other continental countries, and the testimony of farmers and economists alike is very much in their favor; and the best proof of their efficiency is the opposition of the Socialists, who are anxious to force the small farmers, manufacturers, and dealers to take the short-cut to wealth. Is there not a lesson here for those Americans who, having no faith in economic panaceas, are seeking specific remedies for specific ills?

A. F. WEBER.

IS OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM TOP-HEAVY?

BY ELLIOTT FLOWER.

Is the educational system of the United States top-heavy? Are we putting time, labor, and money on the superstructure at the expense of the foundations?

Statistics give an affirmative answer to these questions, but the reader cannot realize how emphatic that answer is until he has studied them. He knows that we have trouble in finding enough primary and grammar schools to go round, but he does not fully comprehend the extent of that trouble, and he does not know how much money is expended on higher education that could be used to ten times more advantage near the bottom. He knows that we have to be taxed for the support of the lower grade institutions, while we put our hands in our pockets and give freely to those that rank as colleges and universities; but he does not know that the latter are so numerous that there are thirty-eight of them in this country that have not exceeding 100 students each, and that the former are so few that it is doubtful if there is a single large city in which duplicate sessions, rented buildings, and temporary structures are not necessary to even a pretense of providing for all children of school age.

It is not the purpose of the writer to criticise the higher educational institutions or their founders and supporters, except so far as may be necessary to point out how better results might be achieved with the money now annually expended upon and by them. They are unquestionably doing meritorious work, but it is also unquestionably true that the work would be of more real value if part of it were conducted along other lines. The nation that gives a fair education to all its people must have a greater future before it than the one that gives a particularly good education to only a proportion of them, no matter how great that

proportion may be ; and, consequently, the aim of a country should be to educate all. Of course, there are bound to be inequalities in education, as there are inequalities in the mental capacities of students, but there should be no lack of room in the basement of our national educational structure. We are told that there is always room at the top ; we should see to it that there is also room at the bottom.

It is hardly necessary to discuss the need of ample primary and grammar school accommodations. No one will deny that there should be room for every child of school age, and no one will deny that the opening of every school year shows the lack of it. The extent of the shortcomings in this line, however, is another matter. Very few people realize the shifts to which school superintendents all over the country are put to avoid turning away children who apply for admission ; and as this argument must hang largely upon their troubles and experiences it is, perhaps, just as well to bring these facts home to the reader first. For this purpose the conditions that exist in five cities that pretty well cover the country, and are at least sufficient to give a good general idea of the situation, may be cited.

In New York, at the beginning of the present school year, according to John Jasper, City Superintendent of Schools, " the total number of refused admissions on September 13th and 14th (the opening days) was 6,913." Continuing, Mr. Jasper writes :

" It has been found necessary, in order to accommodate these children, to arrange for half day sessions in the more crowded districts. Temporary quarters have been engaged, and more would be if the law of the State permitted this board to engage any building that it thought suitable. The State law reads that in all large cities no building shall be used for a large assembly that is over thirty-five feet high and not equipped with fire escapes."

Even after these arrangements had been made there was difficulty in providing for all the children, and a month after school had opened the New York *Herald* stated that in the Seventh, Tenth, Thirteenth, and Seventeenth Wards there were 2,782 children on the waiting list. The police department was then called upon to help solve the problem and policemen were assigned to the duty of conducting children from the crowded districts to those where there was more room.

The conditions in Brooklyn are much the same as in New York, as the following statement from William H. Maxwell, Superintendent of Public Instruction, proves :

"I regret to say that Brooklyn has not school accommodations sufficient for all children of school age. Even with duplicate sessions in most of our schools, many children are refused admission every year."

In Chicago even more difficulty is experienced in providing for all the children, as would naturally be expected, owing to the rapid increase in population. At the beginning of the school year, Albert G. Lane, Superintendent of Education, reported that there were 10,669 pupils in rented rooms and 11,746 that had to be cared for by establishing duplicate half-day sessions in a large number of the school buildings. For the purpose of illustrating what these figures really mean to many of the children who are seeking an education in the city by the lake, the following from a recent issue of the *Chicago Times-Herald* may be quoted :

"In Blue Island avenue, between Sixteenth and Eighteenth streets, there are five divisions of the Blue Island branch school, all located in cramped, low-ceilinged, frame store-rooms. There are no means of ventilating any of them, and in some the toilet rooms are located on the same floor with the recitation rooms, the fetid atmosphere being almost nauseating to one passing from the comparatively fresh air of the street. All of the buildings in which the divisions are located are old and small. They have been used for saloons, grocery stores and the like for a score of years, until rented by the school board."

From St. Louis, Superintendent F. Louis Soldan sent the following reply to an inquiry as to the accommodations :

"In order to accommodate all the children that apply for admission we have duplicate sessions in about twenty buildings, and also have a very few rented rooms for that purpose. It is the policy of the board to replace rented buildings and duplicate sessions by new buildings in the ensuing year."

To the credit of St. Louis be it said that the outlook there is more encouraging than in any of the other cities that have been heard from. Even Denver has to hold more duplicate sessions than the Missouri city, as the following from Superintendent Grace Espy Patton demonstrates :

"Denver has not school accommodations for all children of school age, but makes provision for all who apply for entrance. The number of rented buildings is seventeen, and they furnish accommodations for about 1,200 children. Duplicate half-day sessions are held in thirty-one school rooms."

Other illustrations could be given, but these are certainly sufficient to prove the condition of affairs and to show that it is not confined to any particular part of the country. One general statement that "more room and better facilities are needed" would cover the case of every large city in the country.

Now, turn to the higher educational institutions and note the difference. While the city schools are unable to accommodate all the children who apply, or at least do it only with great difficulty, many of the universities and colleges are hardly able to secure enough students to make it worth while to remain open. Here is a list by States, as complete as it is possible to make it, of the number of institutions conferring the degree of B. A. and having not to exceed two hundred students each :

Alabama.....	3	Massachusetts.....	2	Oklahoma.....	1
Arkansas.....	2	Maryland.....	3	Pennsylvania.....	10
Arizona.....	1	Michigan.....	1	South Carolina.....	6
California.....	4	Mississippi.....	2	South Dakota.....	2
Colorado.....	1	Minnesota.....	5	Tennessee.....	8
Delaware.....	1	Missouri.....	10	Vermont.....	1
District of Columbia.....	2	Montana.....	1	Virginia.....	2
Florida.....	2	New York.....	10	Washington.....	1
Georgia.....	2	New Jersey.....	3	West Virginia.....	2
Illinois.....	10	North Carolina.....	6	Wisconsin.....	3
Indiana.....	5	North Dakota.....	2	Wyoming.....	1
Iowa.....	7	Nebraska.....	1		
Kansas.....	5	New Mexico.....	1	Total.....	149
Kentucky.....	4	Ohio.....	9		
Louisiana.....	2	Oregon.....	5		

One hundred and forty-nine institutions, a few supported by State appropriations, but most of them deriving their income from endowment funds or private subscriptions, and not one of them has over two hundred students ! Could not some of that money be used to better advantage in providing facilities for educating those who are practically crowded out of the common schools now ? Would it not do more good if it were devoted to the establishment and support of trade schools—schools that would get nearer to many of the poor and the lower classes and give them just the amount of education that they need and want ? Does not the expenditure of so much money for the higher education of a comparatively few people, when there are so many who stand in need of just the little education that may make them self-supporting, seem almost like wanton waste ?

Really, it seems as if there could be but one answer to these questions.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to get at the exact amount of money expended on these one hundred and forty-nine institutions annually, as many of them decline to give any information as to income or endowments. Most of them unquestionably have little ; but, even so, the aggregate annual expenditures must amount to more than half a million dollars, and very likely is

nearer a million. A great deal of good could be done with that amount of money. Doubtless a great deal of good is being done with it; but is it being expended so as to bring the very best educational results to this country? Again, it seems to the writer as if there could be but one answer to the question.

Of course it may be urged that many of these minor colleges are denominational, and that religion—or rather sectarianism—gives them a valid excuse for existence. This may be conceded in a measure, but could not one-third of them do all the work and do it better and more cheaply? If a boy wants a college education it is not necessary to immediately locate a university in the next block to him; but if you want to educate the children of the slums you must locate your school where they live. Therein lies the difference. And in spite of the fact that it is of much more importance that the child should have a rudimentary education than it is that the youth should go to college, we exert ourselves much more for the latter than for the former. We trouble ourselves more about his opportunities, we boast more of the chances that lie open to him, and if we have any money to give away we spend it for his benefit. Why doesn't some educational philanthropist endow schools that are needed for the masses? What is the use of piling on higher education without giving many the opportunity to get to it? It is true that some trade schools have been founded, but they are comparatively few. Everyone wants to work at the top.

Look at it from another point of view, and the absurdity of doing so much in the tower when there is so much that is left undone in the basement becomes even more apparent. According to the College Year Book, to which publication I am indebted for a great deal of valuable information, there is one instructor for every thirteen and one-sixth students in the higher educational institutions of the country, and this in spite of the fact that in some of the larger institutions the classes are extraordinarily large. It seems as if there must be a waste of talent there somewhere. Again, if we take out the thirty institutions that have the largest attendance, there is only an average of one hundred and ninety-nine students to each of the four hundred and forty-six institutions left. The thirty institutions referred to had a total attendance last year of 55,021, while the other four hundred and forty-six had a total of 88,611.

This means that a little less than one-fifteenth of the colleges and universities of this country care for a little more than one-third of all the students. Could anything better illustrate the point I have endeavored to make?

Let me put it in another way. Could not the money used for the endowment of the University of Chicago have been used to far better advantage educationally if it had gone into some other channel? Would it not be doing more good now if it were being utilized to advance some meritorious plan a little lower in the educational scale? Was there any real necessity for the University of Chicago? This is not to be taken as a criticism of the University, which is unquestionably an excellent one. It is merely selected as an illustration, because of its magnificent endowment and comparatively recent organization. At the time it was planned there were two good universities in the suburbs of Chicago—Northwestern University at Evanston and the Lake Forest University—and half a dozen more within half a day's ride of that city. The University of Illinois at Champaign, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, and the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor are large, excellent, and prosperous universities; and in addition to these there are sixty-two other recognized institutions that confer the degree of B. A. in the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Michigan, all of which did, and still do, draw students from Chicago. In view of these facts, although without any desire to criticize Mr. Rockefeller or detract from the value and credit of the institution he founded, it may be contended with some show of justice that the income of nearly two million dollars which the University of Chicago enjoys would be doing more good to-day if it were being expended in the furtherance of some plan to better educate the masses, either by improved primary and grammar school facilities or the establishment of trade schools that will teach something of practical value to the boy who doesn't want to enter a profession and isn't mentally fitted to take advantage of the opportunities for a collegiate education, even if he had the time and money.

Chicago is not selected to illustrate this point because she is exceptionally well located from an educational point of view, for she is not. New York would answer quite as well. Without going so far as Boston to the northeast, Syracuse to the northwest, and Baltimore to the southwest, one can find fifty univer-

sities and colleges of one kind or another ; and if all of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Maryland be included the number becomes eighty-one.

From still another point of view it may be urged that it is wrong to attempt to run educational institutions on such small capital as is available to many of them. Conceding that Mr. Rockefeller could not have made a better use of his money than he did in founding the University of Chicago, what excuse is there for the existence of many of the little colleges that are endeavoring to struggle along on incomes that would hardly be sufficient for the support of a good-sized family? One college at Trenton, Mo., has 169 students and an income of \$2,000 ; another at McKenzie, Tenn., 200 students and \$1,500 ; another at Bowdon, Ga., 143 students and \$1,500 ; another at New Berlin, Pa., 79 students and \$3,000 ; a university at Canton, Mo., 71 students and \$1,500, and a college at St. Joseph, Mo., 85 students and \$5,040. These have been taken at random from the College Year Book, and are given merely as examples of a large number of like institutions. The writer does not wish to be understood as making an attack upon them or upon any other particular college ; but, taking these little institutions as a class, he does believe and assert that no college can be properly run on a miniature income, and that the money so expended is needed elsewhere. Yet, aside from those institutions that decline to make any statement as to their incomes, there are eighty-seven colleges in the United States that have not to exceed \$10,000 per annum each, and it is probable that at least twenty of that number have only \$5,000 or less.

The eighty-seven to which I have referred are located as follows :

Alabama.....	1	Kentucky.....	3	Pennsylvania.....	1
Arkansas.....	3	Louisiana.....	2	South Carolina.....	3
Arizona.....	1	Maryland.....	2	South Dakota.....	1
California.....	1	Mississippi.....	1	Tennessee.....	10
Colorado.....	1	Minnesota.....	3	Texas.....	1
Florida.....	1	Missouri.....	6	Washington.....	2
Georgia.....	3	New York.....	1	Wisconsin.....	3
Illinois.....	5	North Carolina.....	4		
Indiana.....	4	Nebraska.....	2	Total.....	87
Iowa.....	7	Ohio.....			
Kansas.....	6	Oregon.....	3		

If the figures for all the colleges were available it is probable that this total would be over a hundred, and very likely nearer one hundred and twenty-five.

What an absurdity it is to try to run colleges on so little

money! How much better it would be if some of these funds could be combined and more students cared for at less expense per capita! To my mind much more could be accomplished if we could blot out half of these institutions, combine the other half into a smaller number of larger and better equipped universities and colleges and devote the money thus saved to the kind of education most needed. Of course, this is impracticable, but at least philanthropists who are looking about for ways to spend money to the best educational advantage can refrain from establishing universities, colleges, and scholarships until those who have to fight for even the lowest common school education have been cared for. According to the best figures at hand, we are spending \$8 a year to a student in the grammar schools and \$109 a year to a student in the higher educational institutions, and it is all out of proportion. If it were possible to get all the figures the difference unquestionably would be much greater. In fact, the money expended in giving opportunities for higher education probably would exceed \$125 a student; and this does not include the money that the students themselves pay into the institutions.

In any event, it is evident that the child has difficulty in getting its eight dollars' worth of education, while the older student is principally troubled by the fact that he has so great a selection that he is bewildered; and in view of this fact it may not be out of place to suggest to educators and philanthropists that they keep their eyes on the ground for a while. They have been watching the heavens too long.

ELLIOTT FLOWER.

THE MONETARY COMMISSION AND ITS WORK.

BY THE HON. CHAS. S. FAIRCHILD, FORMERLY SECRETARY OF
THE UNITED STATES TREASURY.

THE report of the Monetary Commission which has been recently submitted to the country is the outcome of a movement which was begun in the middle West something more than a year ago. The business men of Indianapolis conceived the idea of inviting all the business organizations of the country, such as the Chamber of Commerce of the City of New York and the Board of Trade and Transportation, to send delegates to a convention to be held in Indianapolis in January a year ago, the object of such a convention being to consider the currency situation in the United States and to take measures to unite the business men of the country in an effort to improve it. The response to this invitation was very satisfactory to the gentlemen in Indianapolis who had started the movement. Something over three hundred delegates assembled and were an exceedingly intelligent body of men. After thorough discussion it was decided to ask Congress to authorize the President to appoint a commission, which should consider the whole currency question and make a report thereon to Congress. If, however, Congress should not authorize such commission then the Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Convention was authorized to appoint a commission itself, which should consider the subject and report to that Executive Committee.

President McKinley recommended Congress to give him the authority to appoint a commission. A bill to that effect was introduced and passed the House of Representatives, but failed to pass the Senate. Thereupon the condition contemplated by the Indianapolis Convention having arisen, the Executive Committee appointed a commission composed of T. G. Bush, of Alabama ;

W. B. Dean, of Minnesota ; George F. Edmunds, of Vermont ; Charles S. Fairchild, of New York ; Stuyvesant Fish, of New York ; J. W. Fries, of North Carolina ; Louis A. Garnet, of California ; J. Laurence Laughlin, of Illinois ; George E. Leighton, of Missouri ; C. Stuart Patterson, of Pennsylvania, and Robert S. Taylor, of Indiana. In the early fall this Commission met in Washington and chose Mr. Edmunds as chairman and Mr. Leighton as vice-chairman. They also chose two assistants to the Commission, L. Carroll Root and H. Parker Willis, whose duty it was to examine statistics and collate information for the use of the Commission. Letters were written to business men and others in all parts of the country asking their opinion upon stated propositions concerning the currency. There was a general response to these letters, and many valuable suggestions were gathered from them by the Commission. The Commission considered the currency subject in great detail, dividing it generally into the heads of The Standard, Metallic Money, Demand Obligations of the Government, and A Bank Note System. These general heads were then subdivided into sub-heads, which were considered by the Commission and discussed at length, the acceptance or rejection of each proposition being decided by a call of the roll. The discussions were thorough and exhaustive. The subject was approached by each member of the Commission judicially. Every man tried to learn from his fellow-members, from the correspondence, and from recognized authorities all that he could upon the subjects considered. There was the utmost fairness and candor and openness of mind and a resolute attempt to reach a substantial agreement upon measures for the solution of the currency question. These men by no means agreed when they met. Their agreement was the result of discussion and of self-education on the part of each member of the Commission ; all done with a determination to arrive at the truth. It was an agreeable occupation ; every member of the Commission at the end truthfully expressed the pleasure and benefit that he had derived from the discussions and work of the Commission. It was a useful lesson as to how such subjects should be considered without passion or prejudice, and as purely scientific and business propositions. As I have stated, the effort was to agree upon the truth and upon what would be beneficial to the country if enacted in law.

The attempt to devise something which might meet the immediate approval of Congress was given up early in the life of the Commission, the members all coming to the conclusion that it was not their function to ascertain the temper and disposition of Congress. That is rather the function of the Committees of Congress.

The Commission was greatly aided by the advice and encouragement of the Executive Committee, and particularly of its Chairman, H. H. Hanna, of Indianapolis, who is showing zeal and devotion to public interest, combined with intelligence, that is very rare ; a striking example of what can be done by business men if they choose to give their time and ability to public questions.

The great service that the Indianapolis Convention can do the country will be to furnish something upon which the sound money men who think that there should be affirmative legislation can unite. Heretofore all men have called themselves sound money men who stood together in opposition to the free coinage of silver by this country alone at 16 to 1. No serious attempt has been made to secure an agreement in favor of affirmative legislation to cure existing evils in our currency system and to remove the dangers that lurk in it. This situation is a great disadvantage, because undoubtedly our currency system is seriously defective, and if those who are in favor of its improvement cannot or do not act together the country will experience from time to time the troubles that come from existing defects, and constant efforts will be made by those dissatisfied with existing conditions to produce others still more injurious. It is dangerous for the men who are opposed to free silver to stand still ; they must remedy existing defects, or some day the dissatisfied will try to cure the evils that they feel by methods which in the end will greatly aggravate them. It would be a serious reproach to the intelligence and patriotism of our business men if, either from inaction or indifference or inability to act together in promoting wise remedial measures, great disaster should come to them and their enterprises.

If the gentlemen of Indianapolis who have promoted this movement succeed in producing such unity among business men as will render their legitimate influence surely effective, they will have rendered an inestimable service to the country ; if more

unity among business men cannot be attained than in the past, then no legislation can be hoped for at Washington. Congress cannot be asked to legislate when those whose judgment ought to be governing upon such legislation cannot agree what it should be.

The Commission reported that the already existing gold standard should be maintained and that everything should be done by government to strengthen confidence in the maintenance of that standard. The gold standard, in the judgment of the Commission, is not the creation of government, but is the result of concurring habits of business men throughout the civilized world. Governments adopt standards of value: they do not create them. One who studies the history of money will be impressed with the truth of this. It will be found that the standard by which the value of property and services has been measured from time to time, whatever that standard may have been, has not been the result of laws nor even of conscious agreement among individuals, but has rather been the result of the habits of each individual concurring with those of his neighbors. Sometimes this standard has been one thing and sometimes another, but whatever it was, it has been evolved in the way described. The higher the civilization, and the greater the amount of values to be measured, the more exact has become the instrument with which the measurement is to be made, until finally in this way gold has become the standard in use for the measurement of values in all the civilized world.

Government cannot by law try to change a standard thus evolved without doing harm thereby; this is the unfailing teaching of monetary history.

Of late years governments, for the convenience of their people, have almost universally been compelled to declare that gold should be the legal standard in the various countries of the world, thus conforming law to the already established actual standard. This is a fact like other facts of nature. It is waste of time to discuss whether this should be a fact or not or whether there is a sufficiency of gold for business purposes. Mankind has determined by the irresistible forces of concurrent action that gold shall be its monetary standard. It is the duty of government, having ascertained this fact, to conform law to it. If civilized mankind shall ever find that this standard does not serve its

purpose, then it will evolve a new standard in the same way in which it has evolved standards in the past.

The Commission also provided practically for the continuance of the present coinage of subsidiary and minor coins, but distinctly provided that no more silver dollars should be coined. It also provided that the ordinary funds of the Treasury should be separated from those needed to redeem and sustain the demand obligations of the government, including silver dollars and subsidiary and minor coin, and should keep the funds for the redemption and guaranty of the bank notes to be issued under the system recommended to be established. It directed that a reserve of 25 per cent. in gold should be held in this division of the Treasury against the United States notes and Treasury notes, and a further sum equal to 5 per cent. of the amount of silver dollars, and it imposed the duty upon the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain this gold reserve in this division, and it authorized him to transfer his surplus revenue, if any there be, to this division for that purpose, and also to sell 3 per cent. bonds which shall be redeemable at the option of the government after one year. It also authorized him to issue bonds payable in from one to five years to provide for any deficiency in the ordinary revenues of the government. A special provision was incorporated to enable people to take an interest in government loans by a simple credit on the books of the government in the same way as is done in some foreign countries, thus relieving people from the necessity of taking personal charge of the securities with the danger of loss, and also enabling anybody to easily subscribe for the government obligations, it being provided that such subscriptions and payments might be made at any money order post-office.

Silver dollars are to be continued, but all paper money except silver certificates below \$10 is to be cancelled as it comes in, thus making a place for the silver dollars or their certificates in performing the function of large change. If this were done there would be immediate use for all but about fifty millions of the present silver dollars. These silver dollars, however, are to be exchangeable for gold whenever the holder of them wishes the exchange, thus providing specifically for carrying out the pledge of the Sherman law, and also treating them as we treat our half dollars, quarters, and dimes in respect to their exchange.

The fear has been expressed by some that the silver dollars

under this provision would be a dangerous instrument by which gold could be extracted from the Treasury. Reflection will cause a modification of this fear, because, in the first place, they being made absolutely good by this provision, no one will have any motive to present them in exchange for gold except the desire to have gold for use in their place. This desire to obtain gold with them will be modified by the fact that their limited number will cause them to be needed everywhere for the purposes of smaller circulation. They will thus become scattered, they will be carried in the pockets of the people, they cannot accumulate anywhere in large amounts, so there will be no motive to present them especially for gold, and there will be a strong motive to retain them because of the use that they will serve, while, because of their wide diffusion it will be physically impossible to present them for gold in any large sums. It is proper and necessary that the government should at all times be ready to give the holder of the silver dollar gold for it should he so desire. This is wise, prudent, and honorable.

Provision is made that the Secretary of the Treasury may sell, in his discretion, the uncoined silver bullion; this because it will be a useless asset in the Treasury, and the government should have the benefit of the proceeds, if it can make the sale to advantage; it can use the gold received in payment for it to strengthen its reserve. The gold certificates and currency certificates are not to be reissued, because it is not thought to be the function of government to use its vaults as a warehouse. If banks wished the certificates for their convenience they could appoint a trustee of their own, as is done already in some cities. The silver certificates in denominations less than ten dollars, however, are to be continued at the option of the people. This was recommended because it was believed that more silver would be used in this way than in its coin form, and that therefore there would be less demand upon the Treasury for the redemption of silver in gold. This provision was made for the protection of the Treasury until such time as the business of the country could easily absorb all of our silver circulation. When that time comes, if it is deemed wise, the silver certificates can be retired like the gold certificates.

The next thing that was considered by the Commission was the retirement of the paper demand obligations of the govern-

ment, those that are technically called United States notes and Treasury notes, and it was provided that as fast as they were presented for redemption in gold they should be cancelled up to the amount of fifty millions of dollars; after that no more should be cancelled for five years except an amount equal to and not exceeding the increase of national bank notes issued after the cancellation of the fifty millions of the government notes. At the end of five years, one-fifth of the amount then outstanding shall be retired and cancelled as presented for redemption in gold each year, irrespective of the amount of bank notes that may be issued, and at the end of ten years all that was then outstanding shall cease to have the legal tender quality.

Every member of the Commission was pronounced and decided in the opinion that this provision should be made for the retirement of the demand obligations of the government. There was no difference of opinion whatever upon this subject. The only discussion was over the means by which this should be done in order that there might be no sudden or injurious derangement of the currency or an absence of currency tools for the transaction of business. There was some difference of opinion as to the means taken to prevent derangement by giving government officers power to reissue the government notes pending the completion of this plan. There was no difference as to the desirability of the final result. The Commission could find no argument in favor of the continuance of these demand obligations which seemed to them to be of substantial weight. They did find many arguments in favor of their cancellation.

The present laws leave the quality of those notes dependent on the will of the Executive; upon the quality of those notes is based the quality of all obligations contracted in business, except those specifically payable in gold, consequently almost all of our business structure is involved in the result of elections and will be, so long as these obligations remain outstanding. Business is, as it were, a wager on elections. Then, too, it is dependent upon the balance between the revenues and expenditures of the government. If the government had no demand obligations, a deficiency of revenue would be of little importance to business; it would be something that everyone would know could be easily cured by the increase of revenue or reduction of expenditures. Private credit would not be affected by it at all, and public credit hardly at all,

probably not at all ; but now a serious deficiency in revenue produces uncertainty in all contracts and causes distress not only here but wherever our business and our obligations are distributed over the world. This is an intolerable condition, productive of vast loss at times and increased expense at all times. It perverts the notions of the people because it leads them to suppose that government, by investing something with the legal tender quality, can thereby give it value—a dangerous fallacy, pregnant with mischief but very specious. At first one supposes that the legal tender quality must give great value, for at least the thing induced with it will pay past debts, yet there have been time and again moneys invested with this quality that have become utterly worthless, while there were plenty of past debts that could be paid with them. Men at various times in history, and a large number now in our country, have believed and do believe that the legal tender quality, the fiat, is the thing which gives chief value to money, quite oblivious of the experience of other generations with fiat money. They are theorists pure and simple and refuse to look at facts, and yet if they will theorize a little further they will see that their own theory is baseless.

Out of what can the fund which will discharge past debts be accumulated ? Manifestly it can only be from the profits of current transactions, and in the nature of things the proportion of past debts to current transactions must be exceedingly small. Therefore the power given to money by the legal tender quality must be exceedingly small, because that thing which will not perform the functions of money in most of the transactions of men will be of little value as money. The thing which will not give him food and shelter and clothing, in short, which will not keep him alive while his debt is accruing, is not money in any sense. The statistics of our census since 1890, which attempt to give the amount and period of the indebtedness of the country, when compared with the Clearing House transactions of a single year, show that not more than four per cent. of the transactions of that year can consist of the liquidation of debts that antedate that year, and it is well known that a large portion of the transactions of the people do not appear in the Clearing House accounts. Therefore, manifestly for both practical and theoretical reasons, it is for the benefit of the country that the demand obligations of the government should be retired and cancelled, and

that nothing should remain as legal tender which is dependent for its value upon anything but its own intrinsic value; that the government credit should not be used except distinctly as a credit in the shape of bonds, and that nothing should be made a legal tender which is dependent in any degree for its value upon credit. Credit, not legal tender, is that which gives the demand obligations of the government their whole value. From this general principle, of course, can safely be excepted those moneys which do the small change work of the people. The convenience which is promoted by these moneys far overbalances any harm that can come from using the government credit to sustain them. In this category the Commission thought that under the provisions of their proposed measure the present amount of our silver dollars in existence could be safely included.

Much is said of the importance of the quantity of money. The writer apprehends that government has very little power over the quantity of money. It has considerable power over the quality, and it can probably be stated as a maxim that the higher the quality of the circulating medium the greater will be its quantity. The circulating medium consists of money of all forms, and, in a far greater degree, of checks, credits, and even unwritten agreements between men by which property is transferred. If any portion or any one of the branches of the circulating medium becomes impaired in quality, the quantity of that branch will shrink in volume, and so will the quantity of all the other branches shrink in volume. For example: Let a business house fail. Of course that part of the circulating medium which consists of its credits shrink, but all other credits shrink to a greater or less degree, dependent upon the importance and significance of the failure. *Not only that, but the amount of circulating medium in money shrinks because men hoard it.* If the quality of that portion of the circulating medium composed of money is impaired in quality, the amount of money actually in circulation shrinks because men hoard the best; also that portion of the circulating medium composed of credits shrinks, for men are doubtful what their balances will be paid in and, therefore, curtail credits; so it may fairly be said that if a community wishes the maximum of quantity in circulating medium it must see to it that the maximum of quality is preserved.

The final recommendations of the Commission provide a sys-

tem for issuing bank notes which will in ten years do away entirely with the present requirement of the deposit of bonds with the government. Substituted therefor are the united resources of all the banks that shall issue notes. As to this, too, the Commission after long and careful consideration agreed unanimously without doubt or reserve. They considered the nature of the assets of the banks of the country, and were impressed by the magnitude of the fact that these assets were secured by and based upon the active business of the country, and that their goodness was based upon that which was the condition precedent of all solvency, corporate and governmental ; that no disaster could occur which could affect the value of notes thus secured ; that no business revulsion had ever taken place in this or any other commercial community of an extent that would have impaired the value of bank notes had they been thus secured. It is conceivable that a government may become bankrupt while the great portion of the private business of its country remains solvent ; this has often occurred. It is not conceivable that the bulk of the private business of a country can become worthless and the government of that country remain solvent ; this has never occurred. The banks are bound thus together not for the purpose of securing the individual note-holders but in order that by reason of the deficiency of a single bank discredit may not be thrown upon all bank notes. The object of this is to secure the efficiency of all the notes in the highest degree at all times and under all circumstances.

This thought is worthy of consideration and is useful in showing us what government should do in this regard, and that is to try and ascertain why it is that government should interfere at all between man and man as to these small demand obligations called bank notes ; why it should provide any greater safeguards for them than it does for any other obligations. Obviously the primary object is not to protect the holder of the notes from loss because of the failure of the issuer of them to pay. If that was the sole object, government would grossly and unfairly discriminate between different classes of creditors. There must be some other reason which has conferred the right upon government to peculiarly guard bank notes. The right is acquired thus : Bank notes or those demand obligations have been found to serve the convenience of man in the transfer of property and services, but to serve that convenience in the highest degree the notes must have

great rapidity of movement. To have this it is necessary that they should be issued under a system provided by somebody trusted and known. Government is the best person to provide this system. The system being known, the man to whom a note is offered is not obliged to learn the responsibility of the issuer of the note to determine its value; he simply need know the system under which it is issued.

Government performs almost the same function in coining gold that it does when it provides a system whereunder notes can be issued to serve as currency and certifies that the notes are issued under that system. In neither case does it contribute any capital; that is contributed in both cases either by the party issuing the note or by the owner of the bullion. The government in neither case confers much benefit upon the issuer of the note or upon the owner of the bullion. Either of them could use his resources about as well without government action; but government in both cases confers a great benefit upon the community that wishes to use either the notes or the coins, because it saves the need in the one case of ascertaining the responsibility of the note, and in the other case it saves weighing and assaying. Thus government saves time and reduces in the one case the amount of bank notes necessary to transact business, and in the other the amount of metal necessary for that purpose; it enables a smaller amount of capital to do a greater amount of business, and thus promotes economies that benefit all persons who are engaged in business.

In order to fully comprehend the subject, it is well to consider how instruments like bank notes could be issued in a natural way without the intervention of law.

Suppose the case of a man living in a village who wished to buy the produce of the farmers in his neighborhood, he not having ready money with which to pay for the produce, but having credit with those from whom he was to purchase. He might go to the farmers, offer to purchase the butter, or cotton, or wheat, and to give his notes in payment therefor with interest, and payable, say, in three months. He would say to the farmer: "Within that time I shall have disposed of the produce that I purchase from you and be able to meet my notes." The farmer might reply: "I will be very glad to sell you my produce, but your time notes will not be convenient for me. I have my la-

borers to pay ; I have a number of small bills at the stores, and I wish something on hand with which to make certain purchases during the coming three months. I am willing to trust you, and all my laborers and the storekeeper will trust you, but we wish something with which to settle accounts between ourselves. Can you not give me your demand obligations cut up into small sums, say of one dollar, five dollars, ten dollars ? If you will do this I can at once settle my obligations to my laborers, to the store, and my laborers can settle their obligations ; the convenience of all of us will be greatly served if you will do this. You will, of course, have more trouble thus than you would if you simply give us your time obligations, and you will also have to keep a certain sum of money ready to meet a portion of these demand obligations that will be presented to you earlier than the three months. Now, to compensate you for your trouble in these various ways, we will all be glad to take these obligations of yours without interest." The buyer of the produce would probably be glad to do this, and having done so he would not only benefit himself, but he would have served the convenience of his neighbors. When his produce was sold he would be in funds to take up all of these obligations, and the whole transaction would be completed and he would be ready to go over a like process the next year when the farmers were ready to sell.

Suppose, however, that the farmers, instead of saying this to him, had said : " We do not wish to trust you ; but if you will buy some bonds, and put them in the hands of a trustee, we will then take your demand obligations." The buyer of the produce might well hesitate to do this, for, in the first place, it would take a certain amount of capital with which to buy the bonds ; he would be uncertain whether he could dispose of the bonds when the notes had returned to him, and, altogether, the transaction would be less convenient and less serviceable to the community ; but, however, he might buy the bonds and put them in trust for his notes and then let the transaction go on as before. But when the notes had all been returned to him he would then have an investment in bonds at a very low rate of interest, and his temptation would be to use these notes before the time came to buy the farmer's produce—to use them in other ways not legitimately connected with his business. Should he do this, when the next year came he would not be in a position to issue his

obligations to buy the farmer's produce because his obligations would be in use elsewhere.

Now, permitting a bank to issue its obligations without the deposit of bonds is following the natural and simple course which such transactions would take. A deposit of bonds is obviously artificial and unnatural and less conducive to the convenience of the community than the former method; and if the former method can be so safeguarded as to make the notes issued thereunder fully as safe as they would be if the bonds had been deposited in trust against them, then obviously the former method is better for all concerned. It is shown elsewhere that, under the system provided for binding the assets of all of the issuing banks together, the notes would be as safe; so reason would seem to indicate that the course should be followed.

The principles under which bank notes should be issued and their safety insured having been satisfactorily shown, as it seems to the writer, the only consideration that remains is as to the attitude of the banks toward the whole matter. The report of the Commission shows that had all of the banks of the country issued and kept issued notes equal to 80 per cent. of their capital since the formation of the national banking system, thirty-five years ago, under a plan like that proposed, the annual assessment upon them to make up loss on failed banks would have been about one-fortieth of one per cent. per annum upon their circulation. Take the worst year in the whole history of the National Banking Act, viz., 1893, not counting collections yet to be made of the assets of the banks that failed in that year—and the Comptroller reports that there will be quite large collections from that source—the assessment for the loss of that year would have been only one-eighth of one per cent. upon the circulation. It seems, therefore, that the danger of loss to the banks entering into this mutual assurance system would be so small that its consideration may be neglected.

Men apprehend, however, that under the proposed system there would be such enlarged opportunities for fraud that the danger would be much greater. Of course every safeguard should be created against fraud, and the Commission have tried to propose additional safeguards which will help, but they do not feel that that subject is exhausted in their recommendations and would approve that the most thorough and stringent measures be provided. In looking over, however, the history of the

national banking system and seeing how great the opportunity for fraud is under it now, and finding how small the losses have been from that source as distinguished from misfortune or incompetency, we are led to the conclusion that the fear of substantial loss from that cause is groundless. In a civilized country the loss from fraud is insignificant. If the disposition to fraud among business people existed in sufficient degree to cause serious loss under this system, then the community would have gone back so far toward barbarism that all business would be compelled to shrink to comparatively small proportions because of its unsafety.

The committee gave careful thought to all these probabilities and dismissed the subject with the firm belief that no bank need hesitate to enter the system because of fear of loss from any cause. The profit to banks is of course considerably enhanced ; it will inure chiefly to the benefit of country banks, for it is the customers of those banks that use bank notes in the largest proportions. This is shown by the fact that seventy-two per cent. of all the bank notes of the country now in existence are issued by banks outside of the twenty-seven reserved cities, and that the balance, eighteen per cent., is issued by the reserved cities other than New York, Chicago, and St. Louis, and that the latter two cities only issue about one-half of one per cent., while New York issues about eight per cent. But this is only fair, for the check and deposit system which is used in the great cities is far more profitable, owing to the deposit and redeposit of loans, than the note system alone ; and the latter under the present system, when money bears six per cent. interest, is not profitable at all.

The Commission recommends the removal of the tax from the notes as being an unfair distribution of the expenses of the system ; it thought that it should be assessed on capital and surplus.

The Commission believed that the fair and careful consideration of the plan proposed would lead to its general approval by business men. In this belief they returned it to the Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Convention, whose efforts to secure its substantial enactment into law they hope will receive the hearty and energetic support of all the business communities of the country whose welfare is so profoundly involved in the establishment upon a safe, practicable, and permanent basis, of our whole monetary and banking system.

CHARLES S. FAIRCHILD.

LINCOLN'S SKILL AS A LAWYER.

BY JAMES L. KING, STATE LIBRARIAN, TOPEKA, KANSAS.

THE story of Abraham Lincoln's life will not be complete so long as any man lives who was personally acquainted with that great man and has neglected to make a suitable and enduring public record of all the incidents of that acquaintance.

Judge Abram Bergen, a well-known attorney of Topeka, Kansas, was a citizen of Cass County in the State of Illinois at the time Lincoln resided in that locality, and had unusual opportunities to study his character and to observe his methods as a lawyer long before he became famous as a statesman or political leader. For this reason, and to supply some additional facts concerning disputed points in Lincoln's early career, his impressions and recollections are worth preserving.

In the year 1858 Judge Bergen was just entering upon the practice of law in one of the circuits frequently visited by Mr. Lincoln. Here it was the young attorney's privilege to meet him in the courts of five counties, and to carefully note his every word and movement in several important trials, as well as to enjoy many delightful evenings in his society at the various country taverns. This was nearly forty years ago, but he retains a vivid remembrance of all these events, and of the personal appearance and characteristics of the tall, thin, bony, and altogether ungraceful-looking man who became the head of a great party, the liberator of an enslaved race, and a central figure in history.

"I have read all the descriptions of Lincoln's remarkable face," said Judge Bergen to the writer, "and examined all his portraits as they have appeared in magazines and elsewhere, but to my mind none of them conveys a perfect idea of the irregularity of his features. Studying his face directly from the side, the lowest part of his forehead projected beyond the eyes to a greater

distance than I have ever observed in any other person. In the court room, while waiting for the celebrated Armstrong case to be called for trial, I looked at him closely for full two hours, and was so struck by this peculiarity of his profile that I remember to have estimated that his forehead protruded more than two inches, and then retreated about twenty-five degrees from the perpendicular until it reached a usual height in a straight line above his eyes.

"During the two hours referred to Lincoln sat with his head thrown back, his steady gaze apparently fixed upon one spot of the blank ceiling, entirely oblivious to what was happening about him, and without a single variation of feature or noticeable movement of any muscle of his face. But when he began to talk his eyes brightened perceptibly, and every facial movement seemed to emphasize his feeling and add expression to his thoughts. Then vanished all consciousness of his uncouth appearance, his awkward manner, or even his high-keyed, unpleasant voice, and it required an extraordinary effort of the will to divert attention to the man, so concentrated was every mind upon what he was saying."

In the opinion of the judges and practitioners with whom Lincoln was associated during his quarter of a century at the bar his most prominent characteristic was his rare faculty for detecting and disclosing the controlling point in a legal battle. But not less than this was his clear, full, orderly, and accurate statement of a case; always so fair and logical that it was often said that after Lincoln had summed up the important facts in a controversy there was but little occasion for argument on either side. He habitually employed at the bar the same care and skill in the use of words and the expression of ideas which he so often afterward exhibited when called to a higher field of labor; instances of which are seen in all his state papers, and in the changes for the better which he made in the writings of his scholarly Secretary of State, particularly in the correspondence relative to the Trent affair, which probably avoided a war with England. A fine example of the grandeur of his diction is to be found in his Gettysburg address, which has a permanent place in the literature of the world.

Many of Lincoln's biographers contend that he was slow in thinking. According to Judge Bergen's estimate this was only

seeming. He thought vigorously and thoroughly, but did not speak quickly. In reality his hesitation was only the result of his great care always to know his ground. His habit was, before speaking or acting, to deliberately look through, around, and beyond every fact, statement, or proposition involved, and subject it to his wonderful powers of perception and analysis. This required time, but it made him successful in every important undertaking. While he thought much, he could not truthfully be called a great reader. He knew thoroughly the works of Coke, Blackstone, Stephen, Chitty, Starkey, and later Greenleaf's *Evidence* and Story's *Equity*. He gave but little time to searching for precedents, or studying what is called case law. When he first engaged in legal work there were but few text-books or Supreme Court reports, and only three Illinois reports. There are now of that court alone 162 volumes, and of the Court of Appeals 62 volumes, a total of 224 Illinois reports—more than eleven times the number in existence at the time he quit the practice of law.

On the circuit Lincoln cited but few authorities in the argument of a legal proposition. The old maxim, "he knows not the law who knows not the reason for the law," did not apply to him. He stated the rule clearly, fully, and logically, giving the reason as forcibly as it appears in the writings of the masters of jurisprudence; and, without having seen a decision on the disputed point, generally reached the same correct conclusion as the Supreme Courts that sat near large libraries, having the help of elaborate briefs, and with ample time to examine other and similar cases. Avoiding deception in fact, argument, or law, with his clear vision and accurate reasoning powers, and fairness and thoroughness of statement, he had the respectful confidence of the judges to a remarkable degree. It was easily seen and felt on the circuit that Lincoln did not need to produce opinions as authority, but the presumption was that the Court would be inclined to agree with him on nearly every proposition he made, unless his opponent should produce a case directly in point against him. Even then the remark was not unusual from the bench that if the question had been original in that court the decision might have been different.

By a small class of habitual litigants, and by some political opponents, Mr. Lincoln was often referred to as a third-rate law-

yer. It is not an uncommon impression that a perfect lawyer ought to be able to win any case, good or bad; and a lawyer's skill is not infrequently measured by his success in defending the wrong. But in all the books and articles that have treated of Lincoln it has never been suggested that he ever lost a just cause where any lawyer ought to have succeeded. Where he could he made a very careful examination before going into trial, or even before agreeing to go into trial. If from such preliminary investigation he saw that the law or facts placed his client at a disadvantage, a settlement was recommended. If this were impossible, Lincoln usually managed to get out of the trial by turning the case over to his partner, Judge Stephen T. Logan, or afterward to William H. Herndon, who could be equally as skillful, intense, eloquent, pathetic, and vehement on the wrong side as the right. If, however, by a misrepresentation of the facts or otherwise Mr. Lincoln got into the trial of a cause wherein he became satisfied his client was in the wrong, he appeared very weak, spiritless, and destitute of resources. But if convinced of the justice and righteousness of his side of the controversy, and with time for mature thought, he went into and through the trial with a buoyant, unflinching courage and matchless power.

Lincoln's tact was remarkable. He carefully studied and thought out the best way of saying everything, as well as the substance of what he should say. Every important thing he said or did was the result of great deliberation, although the casual observer might have gained the impression that many things were entirely *impromptu*. This was especially true in jury trials, in all of which he managed at some time to say or do some very peculiar thing, or some common thing in a very peculiar manner. While the jury might have thought this to have come to him on the spur of the moment, usually it came at the critical point of his case, directing attention to that which he desired should be most prominent, and impressing it on every mind. Other lawyers always expected such a feature, and were afraid of it. They felt sure it would appear in every case, but never could tell beforehand just where it would strike. Sometimes he seemed to take a delight in expressly conceding to his opponent every proposition and fact which his own client or the spectators thought to be in his favor, and then, to the surprise of all, taking some un-

expected but firm and impregnable position which controlled and won the case.

An interesting personal and court reminiscence is thus stated by Judge Bergen: "The first time I saw Lincoln as a lawyer was in the old Morgan County Court-House, at Jacksonville, when he was defending Colonel Dunlap, a wealthy, aristocratic Democrat, in an action for \$10,000 damages, brought against him by the editor of what was then called the abolition paper. The action grew out of a deliberately-planned and severe cowhiding administered by the Colonel to the editor, on a bright Saturday afternoon, in the public square, in the presence of hundreds of the town and country people whom the Colonel desired to witness that novel and exciting performance. Besides local counsel, the editor had employed Ben. Edwards, who was the most noted for eloquence of all the Democratic lawyers in the State. Colonel Dunlap retained Lincoln as one of his lawyers for the defence.

"I ran off from my recitations for the sole purpose of hearing Lincoln. Edwards used all the arts of the orator and advocate. He pictured, until it could almost be felt, the odium and disgrace to the editor, which he declared were worse than death. He wept, and made the jury and spectators weep. The feelings of those in the court-house was roused to the highest pitch of indignation against the perpetrator of such an outrage. It was felt that all the Colonel's fortune could not compensate for the lawless indignity, and that the editor would in all probability recover the full \$10,000. No possible defence or palliation existed.

"Before all eyes were dried, it was Lincoln's turn to speak. He dragged his feet off the table, on the top of which they had been resting, set them on the floor, gradually lifted up and straightened out his great length of legs and body, and took off his coat. While removing his coat it was noticed by all present that his eyes were intently fixed upon something on the table before him. He picked up the object, a paper, scrutinized it closely, and, without uttering a word, indulged in a long, loud laugh, accompanied by his most wonderfully grotesque facial expression. There was never anything like the laugh or the expression. It was magnetic. The whole audience grinned. Then he laid the paper down slowly, took off his cravat, again picked up the paper, re-examined it, and repeated the laugh. It was

contagious. He then deliberately removed his vest, showing his one yarn suspender, took up the paper, again looked at it curiously, and again indulged in his peculiar laugh. Its effect was absolutely irresistible. The usually solemn and dignified Judge Woodson, members of the jury, and the whole audience joined in the merriment, and all this before Lincoln had spoken a single word.

“When the laughter had subsided, he apologized to the Court for his seemingly rude behavior and explained that the amount of damages claimed by the editor was at first written \$1,000. He supposed the plaintiff afterwards had taken a second look at the Colonel's pile, and concluded that the wounds to his honor were worth an additional \$9,000. The result was to at once destroy the effect of Edwards's tears, pathos, towering indignation and high-wrought eloquence, and to render improbable a verdict for more than \$1,000. Lincoln immediately and fully admitted that the plaintiff was entitled to a judgment for some amount, argued in mitigation of damages, told a funny story applicable to the peculiar nature of the case, and specially urged the jury to agree upon some amount. The verdict was for a few hundred dollars, and was entirely satisfactory to Lincoln's client.”

It is the judgment of every man who has written or spoken of Lincoln that the most pervading and dominant element of his character was his love of truth; not merely the moral avoidance of a falsehood, but truth in its most comprehensive sense; correctness and accuracy in fact, in science, in law, in business, in personal intercourse, and in every field. All his biographers attribute this quality to him, and it is in this connection that Judge Bergen contributes a new chapter to the volumes of contemporaneous testimony intended to faithfully chronicle his life and work.

In the index to the American edition of an English law book is found this line: “Lincoln, President, Abraham, how he procured an acquittal by a fraud, 269 n.” The text of the note referred to is as follows:

“In Lamon's life of Abraham Lincoln, p. 327, an account is given of Mr. Lincoln's defence of a man named Armstrong, under indictment for murder. The evidence against the prisoner was very strong. But, says the biographer, ‘the witness whose testimony bore hardest upon Armstrong swore that the crime was committed about eleven o'clock at night, and that he saw the blow struck by the light of a moon nearly full.’ Here Mr. Lincoln

saw his opportunity. 'He handed to an officer of the court an almanac, and told him to give it back to him when he should call for it in the presence of the jury. It was an almanac of the year previous to the murder.' Mr. Lincoln made the closing argument for the defence, and in the words of Mr. Lamon, 'in due time he called for the almanac, and easily proved by it that at the time the main witness declared the moon was shining in great splendor, there was in fact no moon at all, but black darkness over the whole scene. In the roar of laughter and undisguised astonishment succeeding this apparent demonstration, court, jury, and counsel forgot to examine that seemingly conclusive almanac, and let it pass without question concerning its genuineness.'"

This story Judge Bergen pronounced to be absolutely untrue, and gives a full account of all the circumstances of the trial in which the almanac incident occurred. Although the case awakened intense local interest, as every murder case does, it became widely celebrated only through the fact that a man so distinguished as Lincoln appeared in it as an advocate. All the larger biographies refer to it: Lamon, Arnold, Herndon, Hay and Nicolay, and recently Miss Tarbell in *McClure's Magazine*. Mr. Edward Eggleston in his novel, "The Grayson's," most effectively makes the use by Mr. Lincoln of an almanac the climax of his story. In the *St. Louis Globe Democrat* of September 15, 1895, a correspondent writing from the town of Virginia, Ill., to which the county-seat of Cass County had then been removed, said: "The old court-house in Beardstown still stands. It was in this edifice that Lincoln used a doctored almanac in defense of Duff Armstrong for murder." This was republished in the *Virginia Gazette*, and widely copied in the country press.

The homicide took place in Mason County, in the purlieus of a camp meeting, where the rowdy elements from country and town for forty miles around had established their headquarters for gambling, horse-racing, whiskey-selling, cock-fighting and other associate vices. The religious camp-meeting people and the rough element, who together then constituted a majority of the inhabitants of that region, determined that every person suspected of connection with the crime should be punished; the former in order that their good name might be preserved, and the latter that the death of a leader of their party should be avenged. One man had been convicted and sent to the penitentiary for complicity in the crime. Armstrong, jointly indicted with him, obtained a change of venue to Cass County.

"The trial," continues Judge Bergen, "occurred at the first

term of court which I attended after my admission to the bar. I had an intense desire to learn how good lawyers examined witnesses, and especially to see and hear all of a trial conducted by counsel so eminent. Particularly was my closest attention directed to Mr. Lincoln and to every word and movement of his from the time he entered the court room until he took his departure. During the entire trial I was seated in the bar behind the attorneys for the State and those for the defendant, not more than four feet from any one of them, and noticed everything with the deepest interest, as any young lawyer naturally would.

“During the introduction of the evidence Mr. Lincoln remarked to the judge that he supposed the court would take judicial notice of the almanac; but in order that there might be no question on that point he offered it as a part of the evidence for the defence, the court accepting it and remarking that any one might use the almanac in the progress of the argument. Lincoln, with his usual care, had brought with him from Springfield the almanac then regarded as the standard in that region. At a recess of the court he took it from his capacious hat and gave it to the sheriff, Dick, with the request that it should be returned to him when he called for it. In the succeeding campaign the Democrats induced Sheriff Dick to make an affidavit that he did not notice the year covered by the almanac, and this is taken by some as conclusive evidence that Lincoln intended to deceive. The only object was to break the monotony of his argument, and to fix the attention and memory of the jury on the fact proved.

“When Lincoln finally called for the almanac he exhibited it to the opposing lawyers, read from it, and then caused it to be handed to members of the jury for their inspection. I heard two of the attorneys for the State, in whispered consultation, raise the question as to the correctness of the almanac, and they ended the conference by sending to the office of the clerk of the court for another. The messenger soon returned with the statement that there was no almanac of 1857 in the office. (It will be remembered that the trial occurred in 1858 for a transaction in 1857.) In the Presidential campaign soon following it was even charged that Lincoln must have gone around and purchased all the almanacs in the court-house. However, I well remember that another almanac was procured from the office of Probate Judge Arenz, in the same building. It was brought

to the prosecuting attorneys, who examined it, compared it with the one introduced by Mr. Lincoln, and found that they substantially agreed, although it was at first intimated by the State's attorneys that they had found some slight difference.

All this I personally saw and heard, and it is as distinct in my memory as if it had occurred but yesterday. No intimation was made, so far as I knew, that there was any fraud in the use of the almanac, until two years afterward, when Lincoln was the nominee of the Republican party for the Presidency. In that year, 1860, while in the mountains of Southern Oregon, I saw in a Democratic newspaper, published at St. Louis, an article personally abusive of Mr. Lincoln, stating that he was no statesman, and only a third-rate lawyer; and to prove the deceptive and dishonest nature of the candidate the same paper printed an indefinite affidavit of one of the jurors who had helped to acquit Armstrong. to the effect that Mr. Lincoln had made fraudulent use of the almanac on the trial. For some inexplicable reason he failed to call this pretended knowledge to the attention of the other jurors at the time of the trial, but very promptly joined in the verdict of acquittal, and waited two years before giving publicity to what would at the proper time have been a very important piece of information.

“ Soon after this I saw an affidavit made by Milton Logan, the foreman of the jury, that he personally examined the almanac when it was delivered to the jury, and particularly noticed that it was for the year 1857, the year of the homicide. I had a better opportunity than any of the jurors to see and hear all that was publicly and privately done and said by the attorneys on both sides, and know that the almanacs of 1857 now preserved in historical and other public libraries sustain and prove to the minute all that was claimed by Mr. Lincoln on that trial as to the rising and setting of the moon, although my best recollection is that the hour of the crime was claimed to be about midnight instead of eleven o'clock, as stated in many of the books. I do not know that this calumny was ever called to Mr. Lincoln's attention, or if it was that he ever took the trouble to contradict it. He might well have pursued his regular habit of ignoring such things. If his public and private conduct and his reputation as a citizen and lawyer were not sufficient to refute the charge, his personal denial would have been of little more avail.

“ ‘Ram on Facts’ and other books which publish what they pretend to be the truth as to this incident do not give the newspaper accounts as their authority, but all are based on a communication by J. Henry Shaw, a lawyer of Beardstown, a political opponent of Lincoln’s, who was one of the prosecuting attorneys in the Armstrong case. His letter is printed in Lamon and in Arnold ; and all other writers who have referred to the case cite that as their authority. Mr. Shaw says there were two almanacs at the trial, and that he believes ‘Mr. Lincoln was entirely innocent of any deception in the matter.’ He further states that the prevailing belief in Cass County was that the almanac was prepared for the occasion ; and that Mr. Carter, a lawyer of Beardstown who was present at but not engaged in the Armstrong case, says he is satisfied that the almanac was of the year previous and thinks he examined it at the time.

“ This man Carter, who was Buchanan’s village postmaster, had one case for jury trial at that term. Mr. Lincoln, for a \$5 fee, had run Carter’s worthless, litigious client out of court on a motion for security for costs. Of course, it was easy to satisfy Carter that Mr. Lincoln would do or had done almost anything diabolical, as it also was the maddened, unthinking camp-meeting people and the wicked, rough element, who alike had already condemned the accused, and who craved the rare spectacle of a hanging.

“ Other features of the Armstrong case were more interesting and more difficult of determination than this episode of the almanac. They called out the mental powers not only of Mr. Lincoln, but of his shrewd antagonists. In their solution Lincoln showed that he had mastered some technical questions in anatomy. The main witness testified that he saw Armstrong strike the deceased on the forehead with a slung-shot. The physicians testified that the blow on the forehead was inflicted by a man’s fist. They further testified that death was caused by a blow with a club on the back of the head, which other evidence showed had been given by the man then in the penitentiary ; and this evidence failed to prove that Armstrong was acting in concert with him. Lincoln’s principal medical witness was Dr. Benjamin F. Stephenson, of Petersburg, Illinois, who afterward attained celebrity and honor as the founder and first organizer of the Grand Army of the Republic.”

JAMES L. KING.

THE CRISIS OF CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

BY H. T. NEWCOMB.

At the close of the war for the preservation of the Union, the question of the limitation or abolition of slavery, over which there had been sectional and partisan controversy for sixty years, being permanently settled, thoughtful and patriotic citizens saw in fiscal and administrative reforms the greatest opportunity for advancing the public welfare, and as one phase of this movement both of the great parties were impelled to adopt in their national conventions of 1872 strong declarations in favor of reform in the civil service. The Republican platform upon which General Grant was elected the second time favored laws which would "abolish the evils of patronage and make honesty, efficiency, and fidelity the essential qualifications for public position," and at the same time declared that "any system of the civil service under which the subordinate positions of the government are considered rewards for mere party zeal is fatally demoralizing." The joint platform of the Democrats and Liberal Republicans expressed the belief that "honesty, capacity, and fidelity constitute the only valid claim to public employment," and that Federal officers should no longer be selected under a system of "arbitrary favoritism and patronage."

The persistence of the demand for the elimination of partisanship from the selection of minor officials which was thus recognized is shown by the fact that, at every national convention held by the Republican party, the principle of civil service reform which was first enunciated in 1872 has been reiterated with constantly increasing emphasis, and that it was not until 1896, when forces which had been previously subordinate in the Democratic party became ascendant, that the latter ceased to declare its adherence to the merit system and withdrew its endorse-

ment from the civil service law which, sustained by Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, had become, in the minds of many, a settled portion of the national polity. The declaration in regard to the Federal civil service adopted by the Democratic National Convention which met at Chicago during July, 1896, was regarded by many individuals whose opposition to independent, free-coinage of silver at double its commercial valuation by the United States was by no means nominal, as the most unsatisfactory plank in the remarkable platform there adopted. Opposition to tenure during good behavior—for it was necessary so to translate the term “life-tenure” in order to give it any practical meaning—and approval of an extension of the system of fixed terms, which, when applied to minor ministerial offices, has always borne evil fruit, were no doubt correctly construed to mask but imperfectly a general attack upon the system which bases appointment upon established fitness, and continuance and advancement in office upon the degree of ability and fidelity displayed in the service. On the other hand, the declaration adopted by the Republican party in national convention at St. Louis was definitely satisfactory to reformers. It promised thorough and honest enforcement of the law, recognized the existence of opportunities for its extension, and promised that it should be applied whenever practicable. The candidate of the party, whose long public service differentiated him from many, if not most, of his predecessors of both parties, in that his record on no important public question was merely negative, had spoken and voted for the civil service law while a member of the House of Representatives, and again, in his letter accepting the nomination, reiterated in forcible words his adherence to the principles of the merit system. One has only to examine the record of Republican pledges and performance to ascertain, beyond peradventure, that no taint of sympathy with or responsibility for the present unfortunate and untimely attack upon the policy of reform attaches either to President McKinley or to the other real leaders of his party. In fact, in the face of the most persistent solicitation from those who desire a relaxation of the rules which exclude from office the incapable and unfit, the President has, thus early in his term of office, extended the merit system to many places hitherto unprotected from the spoilsmen, and has also established a most wise and beneficent

rule which removes from faithful, capable, and efficient employees the menace of unjust dismissal.

That the repeated and emphatic pledges of the party, and the earnest purpose to sustain and extend the merit system manifested by the President, have not been sufficient to prevent an attack upon that system from sources claimed to be Republican, is not so surprising as it would be were it not perfectly evident that it derives its inspiration and support solely from a small clique of bosses and machine politicians. It is one of the unfortunate incidents of the system of party government, which must, at least temporarily, be borne for the sake of overbalancing benefits, that persons whose relation to any party is invariably selfish and frequently mercenary, and who represent no intelligent or honest constituency, are, nevertheless, too often able, by reason of their experience and skill in political trickery, and their absolute independence of conscientious restraint, sufficiently to dominate local conventions, when no important principles are known to be at stake, to secure the adoption of resolutions of almost any character in relation to subjects not popularly regarded as among the issues of current political controversy. Such persons are opposed to any system which makes fitness a prerequisite of appointment, because it excludes them, together with their most useful adherents, from public office, and makes it impossible to impose upon taxpayers the double burden of maintaining an extravagant and wasteful service, and of supporting the partisan machinery to which such inefficiency and extravagance are due. With this incentive and under these conditions it has been possible to secure during the current year the adoption by a few Republican State conventions, and by the National League of Republican Clubs, of resolutions which appear to represent a desire for the reversal of the policy of the President in regard to civil service reform, but which are easily determined to be merely indicative of a spurious public sentiment, the only real existence of which is in the minds of a few professional politicians. These resolutions exhibit little unity of purpose other than a general disposition to criticise, disingenuously, the existing system, their most striking similarity being that none of them contains an endorsement of the principles of civil service reform, and that they differ from the Republican national platforms of 1884, 1888, 1892, and 1896, that is from

every platform adopted by that party since the inauguration of the reform during the administration of President Arthur, in that they fail to claim for the Republican party the honor and credit of having created and continued the merit system.

The Republicans of Kentucky declared in State convention their opposition to "a system of civil service that builds up an official class of practically life tenure," and demanded "that the civil service be so modified as to limit the terms of service to four years, with the privilege of reappointment or promotion." In Ohio, the Republican State convention contented itself with denouncing "the violation of the civil service act by President Cleveland in those orders which extended its operation beyond its purpose and interest," and demanding "such revocation of orders or modification of the law as will accomplish its manifest purpose;" while their brethren in Pennsylvania, after denouncing President Cleveland for making an "unjust extension," declared that "the offices of the federal government have been filled with representatives of a single party," and that "the standard of efficiency has been degraded." The leading Republican newspaper of the State of Pennsylvania said editorially on the day subsequent to the adoption of this platform :

"On the civil service question the platform is lame, uninformed, self-stultifying, and heretical. Its crude language betrays a misunderstanding . . . of the true nature of the reform. . . . Running through it all is an unconcealed hostility to the essence of the reform, and in this it is at war with the National Republican platform, and with the general Republican sentiment."

The National League of Republican Clubs, after listening to an address in which its president declared that "the Republican party will take no backward steps as to the civil service reform—it has repeatedly declared in favor of it"—and that "the mere fact that a man who fills an office is a Democrat is *prima facie* evidence of the other fact that an investigation ought to be made as to his ability to fill it," adopted a platform which described the extension of the merit system by President Cleveland as "a sham, and a fraud, and a subversion of the civil service law," and favored "a modification of the rules and provisions of said law for the benefit of the public service and to remedy the gross injustice thus perpetrated."

The League of Republican State Clubs, an organization composed of residents of the various States, who, as public officials

or for other purposes, are temporarily located at the National capital, has forwarded to President McKinley a petition from which the following is an excerpt :

"Your petitioners understand that the civil service law was enacted to secure an improvement of the civil service, but during the past four years its administration has resulted in marked deterioration, loss of efficiency and economy in the service as compared with the merit system existing at the time of the passage of the law."

There has also been recently formed at Washington an organization which, though admitting citizens of all shades of political belief, has adopted the name "National Republican Anti-Civil Service League" and has for its ultimate object the repeal of the civil service law. The president of this association, in a letter written for publication, said :

"An issue has been forced upon the American people by what is known as civil service reform, and the struggle is to come between the devotees of that political contrivance and the common sense of the American people. . . . It is not of American parentage, but is the twin sister of free trade, and is not adapted to our government, for it subverts the policies established by the founders of this government, and does not consist with the genius and spirit of American institutions. It is a useless and expensive luxury."

Happily it is impossible to regard these declarations as in any way indicative of true Republican sentiment. That party is no more pledged to its policy of compensating for the extra labor cost of American manufactures by means of duties on imported goods, than to the support of the civil service law now on the statute-book, and the greatest practicable extension of its application; nor is there any reason to believe that its ablest and most trusted leaders or the mass of its voters are more heartily in favor of the former than of the latter. The President elected by that party, after it had been excluded from office for a period of four years, during which the number of places covered by the rules was doubled, has declared that "reform in the civil service must go on. . . . The best interests of the country demand this, and the people heartily approve the law."

The national platform of 1896 said :

"The civil service law was placed on the statute-book by the Republican party, which has always sustained it, and we renew our repeated declarations that it shall be thoroughly and honestly enforced and extended wherever practicable."

And, in accepting the nomination, President McKinley pro-

nounced this declaration "in keeping with the position of the party for the past twenty-four years." Among many declarations of fidelity to the reform, it is interesting to recall the rebuke which the Republican National Convention of 1888 administered to certain prominent civil service reformers. It reads :

"The men who abandoned the Republican party in 1884, and continue to adhere to the Democratic party, have deserted not only the cause of honest government, of sound finance, of freedom, of purity of the ballot, but *especially* have deserted the cause of reform in the civil service."

One who respects the history and the intelligence of the Republican party, and who believes that politics is something higher than a struggle for spoils, will not readily consent to believe that these clear and solemn utterances are overruled by the later pseudo-Republican declarations that have been quoted. The comment of the *Philadelphia Press* upon the platform adopted in Pennsylvania has been given. In commenting, editorially, at the time, on President Cleveland's orders, which made the much-debated extensions of the application of the civil service law, the *New York Tribune* said :

"If all the offices in the country, except those the occupants of which have to do with fixing policies, were taken from the domain of politics, both parties would be stronger, would more perfectly fulfil the purpose of their existence, and give the country a better government."

And subsequently :

"That final extension was neither a midnight order nor was it taken on the eve of election. It was made on May 6, 1896, and met with the general commendation of the press of both parties."

In an editorial published on July 15, 1897, the same paper said :

"The merit system will not be modified in favor of spoilsmen. . . . Their attack is on the merit system in general and their demands, though taking the form of complaint against Democrats and prayers to a Republican administration, are in reality appeals for a reversal of consistent Republican policy. . . . The extension of the merit system is a Republican policy, and spoilsmen might as well reconcile themselves to the fact. The party is hurt rather than helped by patronage. Men who cry for the correction of abuses by the substitution of new ones are entitled to no consideration. The test of merit is the only substitute which Republican principles and Republican pledges permit."

If apology for the frequent allusion to a particular party is required, it is only necessary to direct attention to the fact that the immediate, and quite possibly the ultimate, future of civil service reform rests with the party which now controls the exec-

utive branch of government, and, with a large majority in the popular branch of Congress, is able practically to dominate legislation.

Let the Philadelphia *Ledger* speak for good citizens regardless of party :

"It is useless to reason with a party worker who is 'after a job,' and impossible to convince him that party service is not the all-important qualification for the procuring of a government office, but the overwhelming majority of American citizens, who are neither office-seekers nor office-holders, whatever their partisan proclivities may be, are interested in an honest, faithful performance of duty on the part of their public servants. They are opposed to any modification of the civil service rules which will be a step backward in the direction of the spoils system, with its profligacy and its wanton waste of the public funds."

Those who are responsible for the present attack on civil service reform seek, first, to prevent further extensions of the merit system ; second, to secure the revocation of the orders by which President Cleveland added about 30,000 places to the number classified ; and, finally, to secure the actual repeal of the civil service law. Recent expressions point to a complete abandonment on their part of any hope they may have formerly entertained that the President could be induced to violate his pledges, and indicate that efforts are to be concentrated in an attempt to secure from the present Congress a modification of the law, or, failing that, to so manipulate district conventions as to secure a majority for repeal in 1898. A leader in the attack has outlined this plan of campaign with some clearness. The following is from a speech printed in the *Congressional Record* of August 11, 1897 :

"It is said that the President ought to modify and change the orders of Mr. Cleveland. It must be borne in mind in this connection that President McKinley has always favored a civil service system. . . . This system and its outrages have all been born of Congressional action. They are all based upon the statute known as the civil service enactment. . . . I for one, deeply as I feel the wrongs, will not ask the President of the United States, even though my voice might be heeded, to incur the responsibility of reversing the action of his predecessors beyond that which to his own good sense and good judgment may be commended ; but I will ask the Congress of the United States to modify this law, and I say right here, Mr. Speaker, without any menace, that this voice, this demand of the people, this shout of denunciation, has got to be recognized on this floor. . . . If this Congress fails to act the elections of 1898 will be close at hand and the people of the country will be heard from."

Evidently, then, the dangers now to be feared are : First, that

the present Congress may be induced to take some action amounting to a retrogression, or that secret manipulation of the nominating conventions may secure a majority unfavorable to the law in the Fifty-Sixth Congress. As neither of these results can be accomplished unless the honest and intelligent masses of the people can be kept in ignorance of what is taking place, the cause of good government may be somewhat served by a rapid recapitulation of the present status of the reform of the civil service, and an enumeration of some of the benefits already achieved.

The rapid expansion of the system under two Republican and two Democratic administrations previous to that of President McKinley has left little opportunity for extension except by the slow natural growth of the portions of the service already classified, and the inclusion of fourth-class postmasters and United States consuls. The inclusion of the latter must be preceded by legislation, while with regard to both postmasters and consuls there are serious practical obstacles to immediate classification.

The final extensions of the system by the executive orders of May 6, 1896, which have been the subject of recent animadversion, brought within the classified service nearly every civil position not subject to confirmation by the Senate, including those of messengers, watchmen, chiefs of division, chief clerks, and disbursing officers, and, if the rule governing removals recently promulgated be excepted, constituted the greatest advance since the enactment of the civil service law. It must be remembered also in considering the present crisis of the reform that the only proposition now advanced by its opponents that is at all likely to be successful under any circumstances is that for the revocation of these orders. Though projects for the actual repeal of the law have come forward from time to time, after substantially regular intervals ever since its passage, and will undoubtedly continue, as on the present occasion, to have a few blatant and noisy adherents, no one really anticipates their success.

There are three things which, according to the extent of its application, the merit system has accomplished for the betterment of the civil service. It has removed positions of minor importance from the sphere of partisan conflict, and, in consequence, has notably purified political methods by making it impossible to use those positions as rewards for partisan activity. Nothing short of the total abolition of the patronage system will

effectually and permanently eliminate from political contests the debasing influence of "spoils," and the return of any of the positions now included to the category of excepted places would make them immediately available for rewarding partisan zeal and activity. A second result of the merit system has been to open the door to employment in the public service to all citizens, regardless of party affiliations or personal or political services in behalf of persons holding influential positions. Equality of opportunity, "the right," as it was expressed in the Republican national platform of 1876, "of all citizens to share in the honor of rendering faithful service to the country," which was effectively denied prior to 1883 by the practical limitation of appointments to office to the friends of those composing the ascendant faction of the party in power, was accorded to every citizen so far as entrance to the civil service is concerned by the reform law of that year and the regulations promulgated by the commission which it created. Under its operation no individual, however destitute of political connections, is excluded, provided he possesses the intelligence, industry, and pluck necessary to qualify himself to become a desirable public servant. But opportunity to enter the public service is of little value to those who must be considered, from the practical standpoint of efficiency, best equipped therefor, unless it includes a possibility of growth and development therein that will enable those entering in the lowest grades to aspire, not without reasonable hope, to the positions of higher honor, responsibility and emolument.

To those who have observed at close range the methods of work in the executive departments at Washington, both prior and subsequent to the inauguration of the reform, the most apparent achievement of the merit system has been in the increased efficiency of the official machinery. This has resulted not only from the marked improvement in the qualifications of new employees, but also from the relief afforded the higher officials from the necessity they were formerly under of spending a large portion of their time in hearing appeals for office and weighing the conflicting claims of rival applicants; the possibility of organizing the clerical force with regard solely to its efficiency, and the increased incentive to industry and fidelity under a system in which advancement is made the reward of meritorious service. Under the spoils system the interference of persons having polit-

ical influence in the internal affairs of the executive departments was most common. Designations for particular duties supposed to be desirable, opportunities for travelling at public expense, extraordinary leaves of absence with compensation, and similar favors were sought by senators and representatives on behalf of their favorites, and weak-kneed officials not infrequently believed themselves under the necessity of yielding in spite of the fact that the quality of the service was seriously impaired by their complaisance. As evidence that the smallest details of office management were not considered by some of the people's representatives too insignificant to occupy their time, the writer may be allowed to mention an instance within his personal knowledge in which Congressional interference extended to the location of the desk of a subordinate in one of the offices at Washington. Only those who have engaged in the effort to secure satisfactory results in spite of such hindrances and annoyances, can realize the full extent of their injury to the public service and their cost to the taxpaying public.

The incentive to diligence in the performance of duties is in direct correspondence with the degree of confidence on the part of employees that their future in the service is dependent upon the quality of their services and the sufficiency of the rewards the industrious and capable may reasonably anticipate. The revocation of the recent extensions will remove in a large degree the strong incentive to industrious application now existing, and while it is true that the alternative, fear of immediate dismissal, can be used as a whip, the latter besides being an unkind and brutal substitute is also unsatisfactory because it produces a class of unwilling and disaffected employees.

There is a rapidly growing belief that the development of the merit system will soon make an honorable profession of the civil service, as similar methods have already done in the most enlightened countries of Europe. There are many positions the pecuniary emoluments of which are small, yet which, from the opportunities they offer for original investigation and research under most satisfactory conditions, are exceedingly attractive to young men of scientific attainments and aspirations. Not only is this true, but subordinates in these offices are receiving the very kind of training which will best fit them for holding the higher places, and the hope that they may do so in the fulness of time

is a strong inducement to earnest work and unceasing application to duty. Young men of education and ability would refuse to enter a service from the higher places of which they were arbitrarily excluded.

Competition for places in the civil service would be limited to those who were conscious of inability to excel anywhere; who had already failed in private business, or who felt the need of temporary shelter while awaiting a favorable opportunity to begin a career elsewhere. It is perfectly obvious that the most efficient and satisfactory employees cannot be drawn from any or all of these classes, and that a system which thus limits the desire to enter public service must be extravagant and costly.

H. T. NEWCOMB.

RAILROADS VERSUS CANALS.

BY J. A. LATCHA.

THE collapse of industry and commerce in the United States during the past five years has been due primarily to commercial war. That warfare has raged among men with varying intensity from the days of primitive man, when organized forays were made upon hostile tribes, and men, women and children were murdered or stolen, together with their goods and chattels. Modern methods are somewhat different, but the results are practically the same. The commercial depredations of one nation upon the accumulated wealth of others are to-day almost as ferocious and destructive as in the dawn of man's history.

The yeomanry of Great Britain have been for centuries the pride of that powerful Empire, and have been the theme of her bards for generations. Yet to-day the yeomanry class of the British Isles is almost extinct, and the wealth and power of England rest upon the delvers of her mines and the toilers at her furnaces, not classes to incite or enjoy epics, and especially not classes usually inspired with a passionate love of country, without which no nation long can continue a masterful people. It must be clear that the decadence of the agricultural interests of Great Britain has been almost entirely due to the enormous growth of our cereal interests. In the brief period of a quarter of a century our husbandmen seized the wealth of Europe, entailing bankruptcy upon the rustic population of Great Britain, Germany and other Continental countries. In the fulness of time India, Argentina, and Australia pressed to the front, contending with us for wealth and power, pouring their grain upon manufacturing Europe to our commercial undoing. Argentina, among the youngest and most vigorous of our opponents in the grain markets of the world, has become bank-

rupt in the struggle, and to meet interest on her debt must sell her products at a loss, if necessary, to meet the exactions of her taskmasters. Under the stress of this necessity her pauper labor groans and agonizes, and our freemen suffer with their fellow-men of the antipodes. But, destructive to the agricultural interests of the United States as has been the competition of the foreign countries named, a more powerful and a more dangerous opponent for us is pushing to the front, and we must prepare to meet this competition or be relegated to the rear.

The vast empire of Siberia is now girdled by a government railroad from the Ural Mountains to the Amoor River, and before 1905 that railroad will be completed to the Pacific Ocean. But more important to us is the fact that a government railroad is now building to connect that Siberian railroad at Perm in Russia with the Dwina River, giving access to Archangel on the White Sea for the wheat from Western and Central Siberia. The country thus open to northern Europe, and especially to Great Britain and Germany, is similar to the Dakotas and Minnesota both in soil and climate. The short distance from Archangel to London and to Bremen and Hamburg renders this threatened competition of prime interest to us.

Thirty years ago the writer assisted in surveying one of our pioneer trans-continental railroads from Kansas City, then a frontier town, through Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico and Arizona to California, investigating routes to San Diego, Los Angeles, and across the Sierra Nevada Mountains at Tehachapi Pass, thence through Tulare and San Joaquin valleys to San Francisco. Much of the territory traversed by those exploring parties never until then had been trod by white men. Having crossed the continent, the western half of which was then a virgin world, the writer had not the faintest conception of the mighty changes the construction of the Pacific railroads would cause, not only in our own growth and commerce, but in the commercial relations of the entire world, nor, it is believed, did others forecast the future greatness of our nation. But in the light of the history of the last thirty years we can foresee how far reaching and equally astounding will be the revolution in the commerce of the world caused by the opening of Siberia by railroad, resulting undoubtedly in Russian control of the trade of the Chinese Empire.

The course of commerce in the ages past marked the limits of empire. Caravans for centuries traversed the gardens of well-watered valleys and sterile wastes lying between China and India in the Orient, and Phœnicia, Egypt, Rome and Carthage, the then Occident. That commerce created the mighty cities of Babylonia, of Assyria, of Persia and of Syria.

The opening of the commercial route by water between the East and Western Europe, by way of the Cape of Good Hope, gave the death blow to the trade of Venice and other cities on the Mediterranean Sea, and Poverty spread her tattered mantle over the wealthy and voluptuous Republics of Italy. The opening of that water route by the hardy and fearless seamen of Portugal transferred for a brief period to that nation the seat of wealth and commercial empire. The military disasters of Portugal enabled the Dutch to seize the trade of the Orient, and for years the wealth of the Far East flowed in upon Holland, making that the most opulent of nations. The passing of William and Mary from the Netherlands to Great Britain carried the heirship of the mastery of the commercial world to the British Islands, where it still remains.

Great as have been the changes in modern times in the commercial domination of the world by various nations, this generation has seen mightier changes in the channels of commerce than centuries witnessed in the ages past, but greater and swifter changes perhaps may be seen by living men. The Suez Canal was built notwithstanding the strenuous opposition of Great Britain, restoring the flood of commerce to the channels opened by the kingly Egyptian Pammetchus, thousands of years ago. Again the waves of the Mediterranean Sea lave the argosies, carrying the wealth of "Ind and far Cathay." The cities of Britain and of Southern France, peopled by virile nations, are clothing themselves in purple and fine linen, the trophies of that traffic. Perhaps again wealth and luxury, pomp and power, may crowd and beautify the ancient cities of Italy as in their regal days.

The Mediterranean Sea for thousands of years witnessed the ebb and flow of the commerce of the world, but the Pacific railroads opened a new world for supplying food for the nations. The trade of the mysterious and hoary East issuing from the dim ages; the trade Alexander looted, yet did not check in its steady, indolent flow *westward*, has started for the first time in six thou-

sand years, on its *eastward* way to the new world. Will it continue on this new route ?

This is the question of the age ; how shall we answer it ? What must we do to meet the efforts of Australia, of Argentina, and especially of Russia and Siberia to control the markets of the world ? What must we do to retain and increase the stream of commerce to our shores from Japan, from China, and from the musty, languorous, and jewelled East. That trade has goldened the sceptre and gemmed the crown of the rulers of the world for ages untold. It has flown westward since historic times, and will so continue unless we can force it eastward over our continent from Portland, from San Francisco, and from Los Angeles to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and other Atlantic ports.

We are told we must build ship canals to meet the contending forces battling for the control of the commerce of the world. Canals for the work of the twentieth century ! The most important works of the character proposed are a ship canal through New York State from Albany to Buffalo ; another along the route of the Chicago Drainage Canal to the Mississippi River, and a third the Nicaragua Canal.

In an article on " Cheap Transportation in the United States," published in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for May, 1897, facts and figures are given clearly showing that traffic could be carried by railroad from Chicago to New York City at a total cost of $2\frac{75}{100}$ mills per ton mile, and that grain could be hauled from Chicago to New York Harbor for three cents per bushel, and that this cost would be less than by ship canal between the same points. Hence it is not necessary in this article to consider all details touching the New York State canal. There are, however, a few facts which should be explained, that the folly of depending in any way upon such a canal may be apparent.

It is not denied but is asserted that a ship canal, if built of the width and depth of the Baltic Canal, whether by New York State or by the St. Lawrence River, would greatly benefit portions of the Northwest. But it is all important to know what portions of the Northwest would thus be benefited and what would be the result of building that canal to our nation at large. To determine this we must go to the foundation of the question at once. If Canada and the British Northwest belonged to us, and by their revenues aided in bearing the burdens imposed

upon us in maintaining our nationality, this question would be greatly simplified. From Manitoba to the Rocky Mountains lies the finest wheat country on our continent. That territory is nine hundred miles long by two hundred and fifty miles wide. It has few if any "bad lands," such as are in Dakota. Its soil is generally deep loam; its climate is severe in winter, as in Dakota and Minnesota, but the summers, though short, are very warm, insuring certain crops. More than one-third of that vast territory is arable, and when thoroughly developed would produce annually from 500,000,000 to 750,000,000 bushels of wheat, while the wheat crop of the entire United States does not now average more than 500,000,000 bushels annually. The Dominion government a few years ago expended thousands of dollars in transportation and supplies to aid settlers upon those lands. The serious decline in prices of all grains rendered it impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railroad to transport the crops from that territory to market at a rate which would leave income sufficient to support the producer. The result was the settlers who were able to leave deserted the country. With a ship canal, however, which would permit the largest ocean steamers to go to and from the west end of Lake Superior, wheat could be grown in that vast region and be marketed in Europe at prices which would utterly destroy the wheat and corn markets of the United States; for nothing can be more evident than that if the British Northwest produce millions of bushels of wheat in excess of that now grown in the United States, the price of that cereal would fall and corn would accompany it in its downward course. But that wheat would not seek Duluth for market, much less would it seek Chicago. The Canadian Pacific Railroad would extend branches throughout that territory and control the carriage of the grain to water, and their water port would be Port Arthur. That grain would not seek New York City for a market, but would traverse the natural water route to Montreal, which would be the great financial centre controlling that commerce, destroying the grain export business of New York City.

When the writer was building the Duluth, South Shore & Atlantic Railway, the Dominion government began the construction of its ship canal around Sault Ste. Marie on its own territory. At that time, it was repeatedly stated, a principal reason for building that canal was to prepare for diverting the milling business

of the Northwest to the Dominion side of the Sault Ste. Marie. The vast power which could be developed at that point must be apparent. While our wheat supply comes from Dakota and Minnesota, Minneapolis can control that business. But the day a great ship canal is built from the ocean to the British Northwest will see the milling interests removed to the Canadian side of the river, destroying the Minneapolis milling business just as certainly as that of Rochester was destroyed by the development of our Western wheat fields.

When the British Northwest can raise and ship by canal 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, British capital will build the Georgian Bay Ship Canal, and every ton of traffic from the Lake Superior regions to the ocean will traverse British territory, leaving Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, and Buffalo hundreds of miles from the direct route to the ocean. The bulk of the traffic of the great Northwest will be carried on British vessels, manned by British seamen, and destined largely for British ports. The truth of this must be obvious, because it is well known that but one distinctively American steamship line is engaged in carrying the world's commerce between the United States and Europe, while a dozen such lines are operated by British, German, French, and other European companies. With free access for British vessels to our great lakes, American shipping would be drawn from those waters; the low wages paid seamen by Great Britain would drive our seamen from our inland seas; the shipbuilding industries at Detroit, Cleveland, and other lake cities would be seriously crippled or destroyed. But more disastrous than all these, the agriculturist in the United States would be hopelessly impoverished. Our Canadian neighbors are able diplomats and keen business men; they know precisely what they want, and hope and believe they can induce us to bear the cost of satisfying their wants. Thus far their waterway conventions at Toronto, Cleveland, and elsewhere have amply met their most sanguine wishes. But should we build that canal before the British Possessions become part of our territory we would perpetrate the monumental folly of all ages, a folly only exceeded by the Trojan's theft of the Grecian Horse.

The Chicago Drainage Canal is lauded by some enthusiasts as the initiative of our emancipation from all ills, commercial, financial, and industrial. The Drainage Canal certainly is a great work and its managers are worthy of praise for the ability dis-

played in its administration. We must note, however, that the Drainage Canal is not finished; it is still unfortunately in the probationary period of "estimates," the bane of all great and new enterprises. The man of experience knows that on a final settlement thousands of trifles are apt to swell the estimates to reprobated totals far in excess of all belief. Let us await the final completion of the Drainage Canal; let us see it used for a ship canal instead of for drainage purposes alone; let us see the navies of the world sailing down the Illinois River to St. Louis and returning in safety to Chicago, the centre of commercial activity at the heart of our continent. We then will know infinitely more about ship canal transportation than we are apt to learn from canal enthusiasts.

A few simple, perhaps homely, facts are suggested for the consideration of those not subject to the ship canal mania. The Father of Waters flows on to the ocean placidly, as for nameless centuries; his broad bosom cheerfully will bear the commerce of the world if it desires to seek his course. The Gulf of Mexico and the ocean offer boundless accommodations for the sails of every nation, and yet the traffic to and from the Central and Western States has its course upon the railroad thoroughfares connecting St. Louis and New York City. If the open waterway of the Mississippi River from St. Louis, which seldom is frozen and which is not impeded by locks, cannot attract the traffic *via* the ocean to New York City, can it be possible that traffic from the south and west of St. Louis will seek the Illinois River, with its dams and locks; will traverse the Drainage Canal, with its obstructions and odors; will go north three hundred miles to the Straits of Mackinaw and return to Detroit, thence to Buffalo, thence by canal, passing lock after lock, to Albany, thence down the Hudson River to New York City, frozen as this entire route is during four months of the year? It is worse than folly to propose canals as a means of relief to the Central, Western, and Southern States.

If the traffic of the Central States will not go by the Drainage Canal and thence by the Great Lakes, will the dream of other canal advocates be realized, that ocean steamers will be laden at the docks of Chicago, thence sail among the cornfields of Illinois to St. Louis, thence to New Orleans, then to Europe and the uttermost parts of the earth? No one familiar with the shifting

sandbars of the Mississippi River will heedlessly pledge the revenues of the United States to opening and maintaining a ship canal along the channel of that mighty river. That dream is utterly impracticable. All the revenues of our government would not accomplish it. Mr. Jay Gould, one of the ablest business men our country ever produced, made strenuous efforts to divert the business of the far West down the Mississippi River to New Orleans, and thence by ocean to New York and to Europe, and he abandoned the effort as hopeless. Before we succeed in diverting the traffic of the West down the Mississippi River, a greater than Mr. Gould must arise to shame his fruitless efforts.

Perhaps the most remarkable canal infatuation of history is that of certain of our citizens for building the Nicaragua Canal to enable the people of the United States to dominate the commercial world and, collaterally, to restore prosperity, wealth, and power to our nation. What interest have we in Nicaragua? Must we expatriate millions of our people to Central America that we may control the traffic of the world? Cannot we furnish support to our people within the borders of the United States and dominate commercial affairs? Has it come to pass that we, like other nations, not only are unable to furnish asylum to the oppressed of earth, but are unable to furnish support to our sons? If so, surely our glory has departed. We desire the trade of Peru and Chile, but this we can secure and yet not endanger the control of the trade of the Orient now seeking our shores. That commerce created empires; the loss of it destroyed them.

If we build the Nicaragua Canal the commerce of Japan, of China, and of India would seek that channel and would be carried upon European vessels, by European seamen, for European benefit. Not a ton of that old world trade would pass the ports of Portland, of San Francisco, or of Los Angeles for our Atlantic coast or for Europe. The semi-tropical fruits of California would be crowded out of the markets by those from Nicaragua and other Central American countries adjacent to the pathway of the ocean vessels passing that canal. Our Pacific coast trade would be blighted and destroyed as was that of the cities of the Mediterranean when the world's commerce was diverted around Good Hope, and we would not have developed sufficiently in the commercial struggle of the world to leave even respectable ruins to posterity.

The struggle for commercial supremacy to-day lies between Great Britain, Germany, and Russia and the United States. Germany is to-day a greater factor in manufacturing than Great Britain, and this fact in a few years will be fully realized throughout the commercial world. The leading trade journals of England are complaining bitterly that German ironmasters are underselling their manufacturers to English railroad companies, and are even heatedly demanding *protection* from this outrage! Protection in England! Marvellous times are upon the world when this cry is raised there. Russia, with its vast resources in Siberia ready for development and furnishing food supplies to Germany, and Germany underselling Great Britain in her home markets, is the situation before us. If commercial treaties now existing between Russia and Germany continue close and satisfactory for twenty-five years men now living may see the British Empire so crippled commercially and financially as to change the entire political aspect of Europe. These facts must be patent to all close observers of commercial war.

We cannot open the Nicaragua Canal without becoming involved in the diplomatic quarrels, the growth of centuries, in Europe. Are we strong enough as a naval power to enter the lists, not only against Great Britain, but against Germany and Russia?

Can we dictate the policy of the Nicaragua Canal if we build it? Can we defend it against the world if our interests demand it? If not, we dare not build it? Our commercial salvation at this time demands that we stake our all on the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. We must delay the opening of the Nicaragua Canal by every diplomatic device to the latest date possible. But when it is opened we must own and operate it solely for the purpose of forcing all traffic crossing the limits of the American continent into channels within the borders of the United States. To accomplish this result, we must make such improvements upon our great railroad system as would enable us to carry the world's commerce at vastly less cost than now governs, and in doing this we would increase the tonnage carried on our lines of transportation. This action is essential for our self-preservation, and must be had before Russia opens the Trans-Siberian Railroad and perfects its outlet to the White Sea.

The failure of the wheat crop throughout the world, other than the United States, in the years 1896 and 1897, has been one of the remarkable incidents of modern times. Time and opportunity thus have been given our nation to fortify itself against the mighty shock to our industrial, commercial, and financial stability certain to fall upon us if there are bounteous wheat crops in Russia, Siberia, India, Argentina, and Australia in 1898.

The building of our Pacific railways was the work of giants. But the boundless advantages flowing from the opening of these highways across our continent must not satisfy our ambition nor paralyze our energy. Continued activity is essential if we are to advance in wealth and power. We must perfect a short, low-grade railroad from Chicago to New York Harbor upon which the agricultural product of the far West can be carried at a cost so low that we can deliver our breadstuffs in Europe at a price no other nation can meet. It is entirely practicable for our trunk lines by united action to assure the completion of such a thoroughfare and at a trifling cost, measured by the advantages which would accrue to the commerce of the United States, and collaterally as well to the railways. Measures must be taken to create a new era of commercial activity from the Mississippi River to the Pacific coast. The building of the pioneer Pacific railways, opening the vast resources of our country in the western half of our continent, stimulated industrial activity in every portion of the United States from Maine to Lake Superior and the Gulf. The reduction of cost of transportation from the Missouri River to San Francisco inaugurated in 1868 by opening our Pacific railways was primarily the cause of our stupendous growth in population, wealth, and power. We again can start a revival of business activity by like methods. Let our statesmen and business men emulate the wisdom, fearlessness, and energy of those remarkable men who inaugurated and carried to successful completion the building of the Pacific railways.

No greater mistake under existing industrial and commercial conditions could be made by the government than to take possession of the Pacific railways, merely for the purpose of enabling the state to realize its claims, by selling those properties to the highest bidders. The close of the century should be marked by the adoption of a broad and wise policy in adjusting the Pacific railway questions. Those railways should be owned abso-

lutely by the people. Heretofore, the government has been merely a creditor of the Pacific railway corporations, powerless to direct the policy of those great commercial thoroughfares. It is unquestionably true that to-day the majority of voters are averse to direct government operation of railroads. Nevertheless, there is a powerful, active, and growing minority bitterly opposed to the sale or cession of those railways to any private corporations, and should they be disposed of absolutely to private companies there would be a perpetual cause of complaint against capital throughout the West and South, which would grow in bitterness if our industrial condition does not decidedly and speedily improve. The wise course for all interests, doubtless, would be for the government to assume direct and absolute ownership of the Pacific railways and create by national legislation such operating companies, as may be found judicious, to administer the affairs of those properties. The objections to government operation of railroads would thus be avoided, and yet every practical advantage possible to the people would be assured by the creation of private operating companies, acting solely as agents of the State under stringent agreement, the violation of any portion of which could be checked instantly by the heavy hand of the government, vested with autocratic power to direct the management of those roads within the lines and limitations of the charters granted. This method of operating the Pacific railways would be advisable even in the interests of private capital, for unless measures are taken to prevent the continuous and disastrous shrinkage of accrued values in the United States the distress among the people will increase, and demands will be made for the practical confiscation of railroads in the erroneous belief that such desperate measures would relieve the pressure of hard times.

For a quarter of a century the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific railways have been operated on a radically antagonistic basis. If reorganized independently, that suicidal policy would be continued indefinitely by these companies. If united as one through line, the interests of the entire United States would be served, and that this should be done is absolutely essential for the welfare of the railroads as well as of the people.

If the Pacific railways are owned by the government and are operated by private corporations under the control of the State,

it would soon be made clear to the majority of the voters that our great railroad properties are operated economically, judiciously, and legitimately by our private citizens. That fact demonstrated, the demagogic cry for confiscation of private railroads for public use would cease. Then private capital would be safe, and with safety would come confidence, and with confidence enlarged and active use of money in the development of our unlimited resources. Then would dawn a new era of prosperity to bless our country.

It must be evident the future development of the United States is largely dependent upon the improvement of our railroad system. In the East, such improvement would enable us to control the food supply of the world, as we could reduce the cost of carriage on wheat and corn from Chicago to New York at least eight or nine cents per bushel. With that reduction we could undersell Russia in Europe even on the grain exported by the White Sea, and the Dakota and Minnesota wheat growers would flourish as they have not for a decade, while the Dominion Northwest would still linger in Cimmerian darkness.

The Pacific railways under government ownership could be greatly improved in gradients and alignment to meet the necessities of the times. These results could be attained at relatively trifling outlay of money, and when these traffic avenues were thus improved and freely open to the use of all the granger and trunk line railroads, gradually but surely the flood of commerce would traverse their tracks. This would stimulate the Oriental business across our continent, and the revival of business throughout California would cause the growth of the entire Pacific Coast to surpass that of any period of our history! As the trans-continental tonnage increased, the freight charges on lines between the Mississippi River and the Pacific Coast would be decreased gradually to the same level as governs east of St. Louis and Chicago, repeating the known history of the growth and development of the trunk line railroads during the past twenty years.

Those who advocate the building of the Nicaragua Canal as a commercial enterprise for the people of the United States certainly cannot realize what that implies. It is well known that half of the wealth and industrial and commercial activity in the United States lies in a territory five hundred miles wide, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with the centre line of that

territory extending in a straight line from New York City to San Francisco, Chicago being the commercial centre of that territory. Good judgment should teach us to serve the interests of the 70,000,000 of our citizens within the United States. This can be accomplished only by ceaseless efforts to develop the traffic avenues where our industrial and commercial establishments are now in full activity, insuring the stream of commerce through the heart of our continent where our people dwell and where our wealth and interests lie. Any other course commercially would be suicidal.

If we have ordinary business acumen we will endeavor to render available and remunerative the \$200,000,000 invested in the Pacific railways between San Francisco and Omaha and Kansas City. To invest another \$100,000,000 and more likely \$150,000,000 in the Nicaragua Canal would render it utterly impossible for us to earn income on the money the government and our citizens now have invested in the trans-continental railroads from the Missouri River to the Pacific. Instead of spending \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000 opening an artificial waterway thousands of miles from our people and our property, which the combined navies of Europe could dominate, it would be wise to spend \$100,000,000 on our navy and in erecting military defences for our great cities, thus insuring our national safety; and then to construct such additions and improvements to our system of trans-continental railroads as would enable us to carry the commerce reaching our Pacific Coast cities from the Orient, through the heart of the United States to New York City and thence to Europe, at no greater cost than the same traffic could be transported from the Orient to Nicaragua, thence through the canal, paying tolls on that costly work, and thence to Europe.

The 80,000,000 population of France, Italy, and Spain are largely supported by income received from the United States for products which can be raised successfully in California. If the lands in that State were fully irrigated and under cultivation, California could support 20,000,000 population, while to-day it has but 1,500,000. Three-quarters of the wines now made in California are comparatively worthless, but one-quarter is far superior to much of the so-called wine imported from Europe, demonstrating that the soil and climate of certain portions of the State are peculiarly adapted for producing the finest quality of

pure grape wine, infinitely preferable to and cheaper than the drugs imported from Europe. Oranges, lemons, prunes, raisins, and other like products can be raised to perfection and in profusion in California. Sugar can be manufactured in that State in sufficient quantity to supply the United States and of a quality equal if not superior to that imported from Germany. It is primarily a question of cost of inland railroad transportation whether the products of our own soil shall supply the people of Maine, New England, and the Central States with these articles, replacing those imported from Europe. With cheap railroad transportation from the Pacific Coast we could retain within our borders millions of gold now annually exported to foreign countries. If California is ever to become a great, populous, and wealthy State, it must be by means of cheap access by rail to the 70,000,000 Americans east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. A dozen Nicaraguan canals would not people the Golden State or develop its resources.

The trans-continental railroads have already been of incalculable advantage to the Pacific Coast. If these railroads are improved by cutting down the grades and straightening the alignment, and if the most perfect modern appliances for carrying traffic at low cost be introduced on those thoroughfares, not only would infinitely greater advantages result to the Pacific slope, but these benefits would extend to every portion of our country. With perfect transportation facilities by rail we could carry wheat from the interior States to San Francisco and Puget Sound ports and deliver millions of bushels of wheat in China. But this will be possible only by waging a constant and relentless commercial war against Russia, which will, in a very few years, be pouring its Siberian wheat into China over its Chinese branch, that certainly will be completed within five or six years.

The Central Pacific Railway has a grade extending 120 feet per mile, crossing the Sierra Nevada Mountains eastward. That grade could be reduced to 75 feet per mile for a trifling expenditure, measured by the advantages to accrue in cheapening cost of transportation across our continent. Other improvements could be inaugurated on that railway which, in five years after perfecting the same and the opening of its tracks to the free use of all the granger and trunk line railroads, would reduce the cost of transportation between San Francisco and Ogden to a maxi-

mum of five mills per ton mile, and through tonnage from Asia and from California, when made up in full trainloads, could be hauled to Chicago at $1\frac{7}{10}$ mills per ton mile. The Union Pacific Railway has needlessly heavy grades west of Cheyenne, yet coal for motive power can be secured so near its tracks, through Wyoming and Utah, that with the Central Pacific Railway open freely for its use, and of the trunk lines, it would be enabled to increase its tonnage, and therefore to reduce its operating expenses until that line also could certainly be operated for five mills and could carry through business in trainloads between San Francisco and Chicago at $1\frac{7}{10}$ mills. Like conditions would govern on the main lines of the granger roads between Chicago and Omaha. Through tonnage could be hauled in trainloads from Chicago to New York on a short, low-grade road for $1\frac{2}{10}$ mills, and that traffic could be carried from San Francisco to New York City, under the conditions described, for a total average cost of $1\frac{5}{10}$ mills. Details can be given clearly demonstrating the correctness of these statements.

If general traffic from the Orient and fruits and like products of California could be carried from San Francisco to Chicago and New York by railroad at a cost as low as would be charged on like commerce between the same points by the Nicaragua Canal, it must be evident there would be no pretext for building that canal. A few figures will demonstrate that our railroads could carry trans-continental commerce between San Francisco, and Chicago, and New York, at practically as low cost as could a canal, if the grades and alignments are improved on our railroads, as explained herein. The distances from San Francisco to Chicago and New York by the proposed low grade, short line railroad would be as follows :

San Francisco to Chicago.....	2,357 miles.
Chicago to New York.....	850 "

Total San Francisco to New York.....	3,207 miles.
--------------------------------------	--------------

The distances from San Francisco to Chicago and New York by the Nicaragua Canal route would be as follows :

San Francisco to New Orleans, about.....	4,250 miles.
New Orleans to Chicago, by railroad.....	923 "

Total distance from San Francisco to Chicago <i>via</i> New Orleans.....	5,173 miles.
San Francisco to New York direct, about.....	5,000 "

Oriental business by canal would require no transfers for Chicago, except at New Orleans, nor for New York City except for warehousing and again for loading on cars for inland distribution.

California business would require transfer at docks in San Francisco Harbor for canal, but would require no such transfer at San Francisco for shipment by rail direct to Chicago and New York City. That traffic would be already loaded on cars for distribution to consumers at eastern points.

The transfer charges at San Francisco would average at least twenty cents per ton each for loading and for unloading all tonnage passing docks and warehouses, making a total charge for transfers of forty cents per ton. Like charges would rule at New Orleans on all business carried by canal to the latter point destined to Chicago or for inland distribution. The port charges at New York are notably greater than at any port in the United States. But in order to make the best showing for canal traffic the charge for transfer at New York will be fixed at the common cost of forty cents per ton.

It is well known to railroad and commercial men that the earnings from through business of the Pennsylvania Railroad has never exceeded 10 per cent. of all its tonnage. Judging from this well-known commercial fact, the business to and from California would certainly be five or six times as great as that to and from the Orient, even when the interchange of commerce with India, China, and Japan should reach an enormous volume. Hence the importance of shaping our efforts to serve the growing business interests of the Pacific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington.

The cost for fuel on the Pacific would utterly preclude carrying commerce by the Nicaragua Canal at as low rates as between New York and Liverpool. Nevertheless, that the most favorable showing shall be made in case of canal traffic, the ocean charge by that canal will be fixed at $\frac{5}{100}$ mill per ton per mile. The extra expense of navigation through the canal, together with tolls on cost of that waterway, certainly would equal, and for many years unquestionably would greatly exceed, the present charge on the Baltic Canal, simply because ten vessels now use the latter canal to one that would use the Nicaragua Canal if in operation to-day. But using the operations of the Baltic Canal

as a basis of measurement, the toll and extra cost of operation of the Nicaragua Canal would average one dollar per ton.

The charge on the railroad from New Orleans to Chicago will also be made the same as on the trans-continental line, although unquestionably the gross amount of tonnage on the North and South lines never would equal the East and West tonnage, and the amount of tonnage on any given line of railroad, other things being equal, usually regulates cost of operation.

With the explanations made, the relative cost of transportation from San Francisco to Chicago and New York City would be as follows :

On Oriental business from San Francisco to Chicago and New York :

Chicago Business <i>via</i> Ogden.		New York Business <i>via</i> Ogden.	
Transfer at San Francisco.....	\$0.40	Transfer at San Francisco.....	\$0.40
2,357 miles rail haul, at 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ % mills	4.12	3,207 miles rail haul, at 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ % mills	4.81
Total cost per ton.....	\$4.52	Total cost per ton.....	\$5.21
Chicago Business <i>via</i> Nicaragua.		New York Business <i>via</i> Nicaragua.	
4,250 miles to New Orleans, at $\frac{3}{8}$ % mills	\$2.45	5,000 miles to New York, at $\frac{3}{8}$ % mills	\$2.75
Tolls and extra cost of operation through canal.....	1.00	Tolls and extra cost of operation through canal.....	1.00
Transfer at New Orleans.....	.40	Transfer from vessel to cars ready for distribution.....	.40
Railroad transportation New Orleans to Chicago, 923 miles, at 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ % mills.....	1.62		
Total cost per ton.....	\$5.47	Total cost per ton.....	\$4.15

On California business from San Francisco to Chicago and New York :

Chicago Business <i>via</i> Ogden.		New York Business <i>via</i> Ogden.	
2,357 miles railroad haul, at 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ % mills.....	\$4.12	3,207 miles railroad haul, at 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ % mills.....	\$4.81
Total cost per ton.....	\$4.12	Total cost per ton.....	\$4.81
Chicago Business <i>via</i> Nicaragua.		New York Business <i>via</i> Nicaragua.	
Transfer at San Francisco.....	\$0.40	Transfer at San Francisco.....	\$0.40
4,250 miles to New Orleans, at $\frac{5}{16}$ % mills.....	2.45	5,000 miles to New York.....	2.75
Tolls, etc.....	1.00	Tolls, etc.....	1.00
Transfer at New Orleans.....	0.40	Transfer at New York.....	.40
Railway transportation, New Orleans to Chicago, 923 miles, at 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ % mills.....	1.62		
Total cost per ton.....	\$5.87	Total cost per ton.....	\$4.55

It would require five days to transport through freight by fast express trains from San Francisco to Chicago, and seven days from San Francisco to New York. It would require at least

twenty days to transport that traffic by Nicaragua either to Chicago or New York. The interest charge on value of commodities transported via Nicaragua would in every case add greatly to the cost of canal carriage, compared with that by rail. Hence while cost of transportation from San Francisco to New York by canal would be less than by railroad, yet as the tonnage to Chicago, the great central distributing point of the United States, would be much greater than to New York, the average cost of carrying traffic from San Francisco to Eastern points would be much less by rail than by water. As the tonnage originating in California would even be many times greater than that seeking the United States from the Orient, it must be evident that it is especially important that we improve our trans-continental railways if we hope for commercial growth between our Pacific and Atlantic coasts. This is of first importance if the widely separated States of our Union, with antagonistic interests, are to be kept together by common purposes and common devotion to our flag.

Not 20 per cent. of our material resources are developed to-day. Those resources can be made available only by cheap inland railroad transportation. This fact is absolutely undeniable, and the people of the United States should ever have that fact in mind when they are asked to build canals in the antipodes. The perfecting of a great railroad thoroughfare from the Pacific Coast to the Missouri River, operated under the direct control of the United States government, is to-day an absolute necessity, if we are to inaugurate another period of development and prosperity in our country. With such a thoroughfare it would be possible to reduce cost of transportation, which would enable us to develop our resources and cause such a steady rush of population to Colorado, Utah, Nevada, California, and other far Western States, as would exceed that of the palmiest days of our nation. The local business created in that vast territory by active, energetic Americans, would surpass our wildest dreams. That business would mingle with the Oriental commerce we would attract to our ports, and could be carried across our continent at a cost enabling us to control the wealth of the world.

Either the United States or Russia and Siberia are destined within the next quarter of a century to be the industrial and commercial wonder of all ages of the world. If the United States are to seize the scepter of Commercial Empire, we must act

immediately. But that action must not be in the mistaken line of canal building, and emphatically not in Nicaragua.

It is impossible, in the light of history, to conceive of the merchant princes of Venice, when that republic was at the height of its power and glory, and in control of the commerce of the world, deliberately destroying their wealth, prestige, and power, and even their national life. For all know that would have been the result had the Venetians built, equipped, and manned vessels for the Portuguese to inaugurate and complete their explorations for opening the water route by Good Hope to India, China, and Japan. Can Americans perpetrate the stupendous folly of building and equipping the Nicaragua Canal for the commercial navies of Great Britain, Germany, France, and other European nations, insuring a diversion of the Old World commerce which will leave the United States hundreds of miles from the line of inter-continental commerce? If so, we will dig the grave of our own greatness, and throughout time "American" will be the synonym of all that is supremely foolish.

If, however, the policy of developing our system of railroads, by the use of every modern appliance for lessening cost of operation, be made the chief object of our efforts, we can in the near future deliver our breadstuffs and other commodities in Europe and Asia at prices enabling us to undersell the civilized world; we can cause the trade of China, of Japan, and of the ancient East to seek our shores and cross our continent, dropping on its way riches among our people. Thus can we create an empire rivalling in opulence and splendor the greatest the world has ever known.

J. A. LATCHA.

THE CHINAMAN IN AMERICAN POLITICS.

BY CHARLES FREDERICK HOLDER.

It is the prevailing opinion that politics as a profession is unknown to the Chinese, but nothing could be farther from the truth. As a race they are astute politicians, and, singularly, one of the most active fields for the demonstration of their skill is found, not in China, but on the American continent and among the American people, where without a vote or even a desire for citizenship the Chinese political bosses succeed in defeating justice, retarding the passage of laws, and adding materially to the financial burden of the American citizen and tax payer. According to the last census there are in round numbers 106,000 Chinamen in America, but there is substantial reason to believe that this estimate is far below the actual number. Since the enactment of the restriction law of 1882, 48,000 Chinamen have returned to China, yet the census does not show the depletion, and, in all probability, twice that number have been smuggled into the country, many agencies for the purpose being operative along the Pacific coast and on the Canadian and Mexican frontiers.

The Chinese are not the simple and childlike folk generally supposed. As a nation they are impotent in the sense of physical courage, and are steeped in the accumulated ignorance of centuries of seclusion; but, on the other hand, they have traits of cunning and diplomacy of a peculiar type. We have in this country a Chinese population of, in all probability, 130,000. The political significance of this compact body of aliens is not generally appreciated, but so complete is its organization, so thoroughly are its individual members controlled and dominated by its bosses, that the writer has no hesitation in saying that the political influence of this Chinese 130,000, or 106,000, according to the census, is more effective without the ballot than that of

the entire Afro-American contingent, amounting in 1890 to nearly twelve per cent. of the total population, or nearly 8,000,000 souls. This could be well illustrated by presenting the attempts of Afro-Americans, aided by philanthropic whites, to secure favorable legislation during the past two decades, reinforced by the divine rights of citizenship, with a corresponding presentation of the successful efforts of the Chinese in America in rendering inoperative laws and enactments which were offensive to their political code, or threatened to affect their business interests.

The Chinaman, with a few exceptions, does not vote, neither does he desire the rights of citizenship, yet he is free to compete with Americans in trade without the accompanying responsibilities. On the Pacificslope, where the Chinese mostly congregate, they are so serious a menace to labor that the successful white truck farmer is almost an unknown quantity. They have usurped the business, driven the white man out, and had it not been for the law restricting Chinese immigration they would either have driven the white labor from the coast and adjacent territory or have precipitated a race war of extermination. We persistently buy from China and send our bullion to the Orient, even the greater part of the savings of the Chinese being religiously transmitted to the region about Canton for investment. Our imports from China for the year 1892 amounted to \$20,488,291, while they purchased from us coal, oil, and other commodities amounting to the very inconsiderable sum of about six million dollars. In one year we ship to China \$34,000,000 more in coin and bullion than we receive from her. In short, China is, so far as our commercial relations at present are concerned, of little value to us, while the compact body of aliens find in this country a productive field for their peculiar enterprises, and during the past thirty years have firmly intrenched themselves, reaping a rich and remunerative harvest.

To protect these interests and their various ramifications, to insure laws favorable to them, to facilitate the removal of obstacles of all kinds and enable them to check offensive legislation, it has been necessary for the Chinaman, by proxy, to enter politics, and to-day, and for many years, he has operated against conflicting American interests a political machine so powerful and well equipped that, with a following of less than one hundred

thousand workers, active and dormant, it has, without the right or power of suffrage, been able to render inoperative the legislative acts of the great political parties representing the majority in this country and a nominal force of over 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 of voters.

Every question that has threatened to affect Chinese-American interests in this country during the past twenty years has been fought by a power more subtle than the ballot. The Chinaman with his peculiar ideas would consider it a waste of time to cast his individual vote against a threatening legal enactment. He divines a better method; he discovers a flaw in the bill and by the use of a powerful combination or machine fights it in the courts.

The internal workings of this political machine are but little known or understood. To the world it is the Six Companies, and is, apparently, an innocent and inoffensive institution, but the truth is that their many-headed tribunal is a perfectly organized political body, having its corps of workers who are graded from the astute statesman of the red button to the coolie thug or debased briber or go-between. As an illustration of how the game of Chinese politics is manipulated in America, the case of the Geary Act of 1892 may be cited. Long before the bill was presented to the House and Senate it was discussed in the star chamber of the Chinese companies in San Francisco, and the political machinery was in full play when our statesmen in Washington were endeavoring, in 1880, to obtain a new treaty with China.

When the act passed, the plan of operation of its Chinese opponents was so perfected that its effects were at once appreciable. The agents of the Six Companies were sent to every city in the East, especially to New England, to arouse a favorable sentiment among the religious societies. Educated Chinese political workers presented the side of the Chinaman to philanthropic societies all over the country, and the framers of the exclusion bill and its friends were amazed at the opposition which arose in the cultivated and educated portions of the East. Other agents visited every Chinese settlement in the country, explaining to the coolies that unless they rallied around the common cause they would all be deported. In this way over one dollar per capita was raised, or nearly \$200,000, a sum which the Six Companies

held as a working capital or campaign fund to fight the common enemy, the American law.

That money was necessary was soon evident. The Companies issued an edict to the effect that its supporters must refuse to comply with the law which made registration mandatory, and the information was quietly circulated that the Companies would respond to the defence of all Chinamen who were arrested in carrying out its instructions. This simple notification by word of mouth through the political agents of the society effectually clogged the wheels of the governmental act for the time being, and cost this government an enormous sum, as nine-tenths of the Chinamen refused to register, relying upon the Six Companies to protect them, which it did, employing the best legal talent available. Every attempt was made to invalidate the enactment, and the spectacle was witnessed of American jurists employed by this Chinese political machine, fighting a law which meant virtual freedom to 100,000 coolie slaves, and a livelihood to the American farmer and laborer on the Pacific slope.

It would be interesting to follow the workings of this political body in its attacks against the efforts of the people through their representatives at Washington, a fight of 130,000 aliens against 64,000,000 Americans, and when it is known that the machine prevented unfavorable legislation for years, successfully fought the passage and operation of restrictory legislation for over a decade, putting the government to an expense that can only be represented by large sums, some conception of its resources and power can be realized. No political body in the United States ever fought a campaign with more diplomacy, more astuteness and with so little regard for the principles of honor which, at least in pretence, hold among civilized nations. But the Six Companies were not embarrassed either with the code of morals of Confucius or that of the powers of to-day; they looked upon honorable usage, the consideration of the rights of a case from the standpoint of morality, equity and justice as an element of weakness and simplicity in the American character, and fought the law with the weapons of the lowest political heeler. The law of exclusion was obstructed by the creation of a false sentiment by bribery, and finally we had the spectacle of the Six Companies fighting it in the Supreme Court, where they were defeated after a hard struggle.

But this did not discourage the leaders of the Chinese machine. They virtually defeated the intention of the law by issuing forged certificates in China, by which hordes of laborers gained entrance to the country. In 1884-1888 other enactments were made, but it may be said that this Chinese political machine so successfully opposed them that they were rendered almost wholly inoperative. In 1892 the Six Companies were confronted with an act which had for its primary object the identification of the Chinamen already here. Each Chinaman was obliged to have his photograph taken and to register. The agents of the Companies immediately raised a hue and cry, and scores of influential American papers took the ground (innocently), which the Six Companies promulgated, that such an act dishonored every Chinaman photographed, while quietly they informed the ignorant coolies that the camera was an infernal machine designed by the "American devils" to injure them.

In this and other ways they defeated the intention of this bill, and it is only by exerting the greatest care, and by the expenditure of a large amount annually, that the present law can be carried out and the Six Companies successfully fought. If the truth were known, there is little doubt but that the Six Companies are still importing cheap labor.

As a suggestion of how this can be accomplished with comparative ease, the writer some months ago landed from a yacht on the west coast of the island of San Clemente, about forty miles off the coast of Southern California. The landing was made with difficulty through the surf; in the little open bay was found a junk and behind the sand dunes a tent. As we approached, Chinamen, who had evidently been watching from the hills, ran toward the tent from every direction, and were apparently much disturbed by the presence of white men. They pretended to be abalone hunters, but it was suspected that it was an off-shore station of the Six Companies, and that the coolies had just been brought in from Mexico, about one hundred miles distant.

As a political organization thinly disguised under a commercial veneer, the Six Companies present an interesting spectacle, and something regarding their history may be germane to the subject. Ostensibly the organization is a human importing company, its business being to introduce coolie labor into the United States, and by controlling the coolies strengthen the other vast busi-

ness interests which they may have. Originally the Six Companies were six agencies in six districts of Canton, who were engaged in promoting coolie immigration. About the year 1850 the business promised to grow to such proportions that the agencies were removed to San Francisco, where they took the name of the Six Companies, the individual names being the Hop Wo, the Yan Wo, the Kong Chow, Wing Yeong, Sam Yup and Yeong Wo. The Companies have agencies in all large cities in the East, and representatives in every country in the world where labor is in demand. They began by importing coolies on a system that soon made them very wealthy, so that the organization to-day, that has its headquarters in San Francisco, has resources at its control so vast that it is enabled to accomplish all that might be expected from a well-equipped monopoly. The Companies select the most highly educated men for their presidents, some of whom have been famous statesmen and shining lights in their own circles; men who are not embarrassed by the code of civilized methods, and who use all and any means to accomplish their ends. Their names are carefully withheld from the general public, while an air of mystery surrounds all the movements of the great organization.

The various Companies differ in size and power. Thus the Sam Yup is the largest, and by its means at least 75,000 coolies have been introduced into this country.

The Six Companies have been one of the greatest monopolies in the world. They have derived a vast income from their serfs, and established under the eyes of the people of this country almost as complete a system of slavery as that which existed here previous to the war between the North and the South. Their method of operation has been and is as follows. The wages of a Chinaman in Amoy are \$5 a month, which is 10 per cent. above the average wages that prevail in China. This they contrast with the wages to be obtained in America, and, as a result, have in the past secured more emigrants than the Companies could handle. These coolies were promised transportation to America, employment, care when sick, legal advice, and a general superintendence. On their side they signed a paper binding them to pay back the money at a rate agreed upon, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of all money received by them during their stay in America. Under this arrangement the Six Companies have imported almost every Chinaman now in this country, and it being their salvation to

prevent their deportation and continue the importation explains the evolution of the original immigration company into a vast political and lobbying federation to fight American laws of to-day.

The Geary exclusion act was a blow struck at its life and income, and at once drew the fire of the combined Companies, as will every act devised by the American people conflicting with its interests. Whenever a measure comes up that is likely to affect the finances of the Chinese of this body, solemn-visaged Chinamen will be seen wending their way to 825 Dupont street, San Francisco, where they are admitted by the doorkeeper upon recognition. The room where American affairs of state are discussed and modes of attack determined upon is a large, oblong apartment with a polished floor, its walls and panels covered with rich silk hangings, large, handsome lanterns being suspended from the ceiling. Around the room are heavy teak-wood chairs inlaid with pearl and ivory, and at one end stands an altar-like arrangement, bearing tapers and rich ornaments, which might be considered a private shrine, but is the emblem or personification and signature of the Emperor, who is theoretically supposed to be present at all meetings. In the center of the room is a small mahogany table at which are seated the presidents, while around the room in the teak chairs sit the members of the Companies, who join in the discussion of the various questions brought up by the presidents.

The subject for discussion may be the election of a senator or representative, and the remarkable spectacle is seen of a voteless body of aliens deciding whether to support the candidate or oppose him. If he has incurred their displeasure by the advocacy of measures antagonistic to the interests of the Companies, a unanimous vote for opposition will be cast. On the books of the organization are the names of every Chinaman in America, and they are so systematized and the owners so completely dominated that a fund can be raised, if necessary—a sum that, in the terse and succinct language of a past figure in politics, is “placed where it will do the most good.”

The methods by which this Chinese influence is made operative are ingenious. The go-between is always an American, and it would be extremely difficult to associate his work with the Six Companies, who remain discreetly in the background, the members never, in any way, appearing to have the slightest interest

in American politics. Skillfully do they dissemble, that even in San Francisco, which has been a prolific field for their work, the general public is not aware that Chinatown is a factor in almost every election. Judges who have decided against them, Congressional aspirants who are anti-Chinese, and all candidates who have aroused their enmity, are liable to feel the effects of this influence always in the direction of corruption.

To the stranger in San Francisco, Chinatown appears to be an isolated section of Canton, separate and distinct from the city on whose face it is a blemish; yet these ingenuous people of joss-houses and dragon are as well posted on American affairs as the Americans themselves, and no national committee-man of the great American parties is better equipped for immediate action along the line of defence than this hydra-headed organization which represents the Chinese.

The Six Companies are essentially secret societies, and in no civilized country to-day is there a more influential organization in proportion to its size than that which discusses American affairs and boldly fights American laws on the shores of the Golden Gate.

CHARLES FREDERICK HOLDER.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

BY SIR WILLIAM HOWARD RUSSELL, LL.D., SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT OF "THE TIMES" (LONDON).

EARLY in February, 1861, I was asked by Mr. Delane, the editor of *The Times*, if I could make arrangements to proceed immediately to the United States to act as the special correspondent of that paper in observing the rupture between the Southern States and the rest of the Union, consequent upon the election of Mr. Lincoln and the advent of the Republicans to power. The letters of Mr. Bancroft Davis, *The Times'* correspondent at New York, were not in accord with the views of Printing House Square. He was an uncompromising Abolitionist; his correspondence was in direct antagonism to *The Times'* leaders. "The South," wrote Mr. Delane, "threatens to secede, but that has been held up as a menace for a long time, and the quarrel will be patched up; for the North cannot live without the South, and lives, indeed, a good deal on and by it," and so for four closely written pages of notepaper. I had many reasons for declining the mission. My wife was in delicate health, my children were growing up, and since 1854 I had been constantly in exile in the Crimea, Russia, India, and Italy. My life was at that time very pleasant. The Garrick Club then afforded the most agreeable society I could wish, for Thackeray, Dickens, Shirley Brooks, Millais, Trollope, Reade, and other delightful people less known to fame, as well as many of the soldiers I had met in the Crimea and India, were familiar friends there. But I was urged by the editor, to whom I was bound by a hundred good offices, to make a sacrifice and to put on harness once more for his sake. I felt I had few qualifications for the post. I was almost entirely ignorant of the nature of the crisis and of the issues at stake, though I had read *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, had attended aboli-

tion meetings at Stafford House, and read extracts from fiery speeches of Calhoun and other Southern orators in the London papers. I had a vague idea that the Southern States insisted on their right to break away from the Federal Union and set up on their own account if they liked, and that was all I knew. Mr. John Henry Dillon, an acquaintance of Mr. Mowbray Morris, the manager of *The Times*, and of Mr. Delane, to whom I was referred for further information, was an ardent partisan of the South. Mr. Dillon astounded me by arguments to prove that the authors of the Union had provided for its disintegration by the machinery of States Rights; and, finally, he confided to me, as a precious arsenal containing arms for the destruction of Abolitionists and Republicans, an immense volume of articles, neatly pasted in order, from the *New York Herald*.

I find in my diary under February 19, 1861: "After breakfast rode from Aldershot to Ascot, and called on Morris to talk over conditions, terms, etc. . . . Returned to town very uncertain and dined at Garrick, where I exposed the situation to Thackeray. He was most decided—'You must go. It will be a great opportunity! As to waiting till you understand the political questions, you will never do it here! You must go out and see them at work on the spot.' We drove out together to Onslow Square, he urging me all the time to go at once, promising letters, etc."

Before the week was over I resolved to go. Then came partings—farewell visits to boys at school, and to wife and children at Bath.

On Sunday, the 3d of March, I embarked at Queenstown in the Cunard steamer "*Arabia*." "March 6. There were not many passengers—several Americans, mostly Southerners; one, a Secretary of the United States Legation at St. Petersburg, had resigned and was going home to his State to help her; 'a Sovereign State before Heaven and on earth! She would go out—that was sure.' 'But can she do so unless the United States government has made a breach of contract with her?' 'That's what has been done, or will be, sir, by this time. The Rail Splitter has split up the Union.' 'Suppose South Carolina is attacked by some power, what would you do?' 'Defend ourselves, sir.' 'But if a native of South Carolina were exposed to some outrage in a foreign country, would you look to South

Carolina or to the Federal government for redress ?' 'Federal government ! No, sir ! I would sooner be cut to pieces.'"

There was on board one very interesting personage who attracted my attention—tall, thin, erect, with a glittering black eye, and fine Quixotic face, full of resolution—a Colonel Garnett, of Virginia, who was returning from some remote corner of Europe to place his services at the disposal of his State, the most thorough-going pro-slavery man. "A Divine institution—an Abolitionist opposes the laws of God himself! There is no power I would not sooner see rule in my State than these—Yankees! I would die a hundred times to keep them out." (And he did die, for very early in the Civil War he fell in an engagement in Western Virginia with McClellan, which first brought the name of "the Young Napoleon of the North" into notice.)

On the evening of March 16, after a stormy passage, the "Arabia" arrived in New York, and I was installed that night in the Clarendon Hotel under the wing of my old friend Colonel Rowan, R. A. The proprietor, Mynheer Kerner, an old Hollander, had served under Wellington at Waterloo. Next day I was invited to see a parade of the Sixty-ninth New York Militia, and bidden to the St. Patrick's dinner. The regiment, a fine-looking body of men—all Irish, under Colonel Corcoran—wore green uniforms with yellow facings, green colors with a crownless harp. It was no harm to look at them, but unfortunately I made a speech at the dinner. For there never was an occasion on which one in my place should have more religiously remembered that silence is golden.

I dined next day at Mr. Butler Duncan's, the other guests including Mr. Tilden, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Barlow, Gov. Seymour, and Mr. Fish. The views expressed after dinner by some of the guests were astonishing to me. I had met on board the steamer ladies who were quite prepared to wipe up the New England States or to introduce martial law in the South ; but here, men like Gov. Seymour asserted with conviction that the Washington government would not be justified in relieving Fort Sumter by force. Then it was argued that, though Fort Sumter was a national fortress, the State of South Carolina, having seceded, was entitled to starve out the garrison if they did not surrender. There was no power given to the government by the Constitution to prevent

secession. To me all these principles were absolutely novel, and the arguments incomprehensible. I began to wonder where the United States joined. An innocent question of mine, "What church does Mr. Lincoln belong to?" created surprise. No one knew for certain—the subject had never given them any concern.

But guides were soon vouchsafed to me, and my paths were illuminated by party lights which sometimes confused the way.

One night in the summer of 1860, I think, I was sitting alone in my study, when I heard a ring at the front door, and as it was past 10 o'clock, and I was not expecting visitors, I said to the servant, "Not at home." But the door was already open, and a voice I loved dearly cried: "Only five minutes, William; I have brought an American friend who desires above all things to see and know you!" It was Thackeray who spoke, and he was always welcome. Taking my hand and putting it into the palm of his companions, he said: "This is Mr. Sam Ward, of New York, nominally a citizen of the world—the rest you will find out for yourself." It was near 2 o'clock in the morning ere the visitors left.

Thackeray met Sam Ward somewhere abroad driving a coach and four on a pleasure tour. They foregathered when the former went over to lecture in the States; but "Uncle Sam" had not then achieved the success in London and in English society which he enjoyed some ten years later. Now he came to do me service in New York, and told me Thackeray had written to him about it. He took me first to a convivial society, called "The Lambs," a club like "The Fielding," a combination of the Beefsteak and Evans, very pleasant and very late, and introduced me to many friends. I had, however, work to do. New York would not serve as my headquarters. Visitors were upon me morning, day, and night. Seymour, Barlow, Olmsted, Dana, Raymond, Thurlow Weed, E. O'Flaherty (known as Stuart), Ducartier, editor of the *Courier des Etats Unis*, Sandford, and last, but certainly not least, Horace Greeley.

A tall, lean, care-worn old man, with wan face and unkempt grey hair tumbled anyway on his head, keen eyes and mobile lips, dressed in an ill-fitting seedy suit of black, a twisted neck cloth with the ends hanging anyhow over a crumpled shirt, called on

me early in the day at the Clarendon and plunged in *medias res* by asking me whether I had "grasped all the facts of the great victory achieved in Mr. Lincoln's election; that is, sir, if the President knows how to use it. There is the victory! What are the fruits of it to be?" I candidly confessed that I was like a man groping his way through a wood in the dark. "There is no darkness, sir! It is all light to those who open their eyes and wish to see." Then and there he bound me to come over and breakfast with him next morning. "I will let you see the light and know the truth! I shall have papers ready for you—you can give me a couple of hours, I suppose?" I kept my tryst, found my way to his room by the aid of his "help." Opening his door, I beheld piles of newspapers, books, and pamphlets on the chairs, on the floor, on the table at which he sat with proofs laid out, something like a shipwrecked mariner on a reef drying his clothes in the sun; but the confusion of the scene and the want of comfort in the look of the place and of the man were speedily forgotten. After a few words of courteous welcome, Horace Greeley proceeded to expound his doctrines concerning "chattel slavery," which, he was careful to remind me, had first been introduced by Englishmen into America. He spoke with earnestness which commanded attention, now and then reading a passage from a book or a pamphlet, occasionally digressing to heave rhetorical bricks against Mr. Buchanan and Southerners whose names I was not familiar with. An hour passed and still he went on. I was hungry, and heard no clink of cups and saucers. After another hour I looked at my watch. "Bear with me a little longer! I wish you to understand clearly the villainous machinations by which these scoundrels mastered the people, blinded them, destroyed their moral sense, degraded the Legislature, and corrupted the administration of the law," etc. For another hour and ten minutes I sat, and still the flood poured on. Mr. Greeley had forgotten all about breakfast. I had not. Besides, I had engagements to keep. As he was rising to the height of his great argument, with many apologies for the interruption, I said I must go. "But you will come back again? I have some more important matters to explain to you, and I was only just breaking ground." I never saw Horace Greeley again. I went to Washington next day. I was moved by his sincerity and enthusiasm. He made me understand John Brown.

"Arrived at Willard's Hotel, Washington, on the 26th March." In a maelstrom! Every room full, every corridor crowded and currents of nervous, anxious men flowing down and struggling up the staircases, groups on the landings, in the hall, the reading-room and barber's shop, the writing-room, on the hotel steps—these were the seekers after office—"the place hunters." "Two thousand five hundred patriots dined here, sir, a few days before you came! I guess you could not well equal that in your city," said the clerk at the office desk. "Every one wants a place and it must be found, or he'll know the reason why he's not in Abraham's bosom." The clerk was, as I discovered later, a gentleman "of Southern proclivities." I dined with Mr. Sandford, who was going out as Minister to Brussels, and was introduced to Mr. Truman Smith, a large, solid-headed citizen; Mr. Foster, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Keen, Mr. Anthony, Mr. Seward, and some others whose names I forget—a very interesting evening. Mr. Seward, in face and figure, put me in mind of Douglas Jerrold, when in a serious mood; small and meagre rather; with nervous face, fine brow, and head well thatched with snowy hair; subtle and quick—not a wit, but a *raconteur* given to talk at large. Mr. Anthony was the most pleasant of the company; Mr. Foster, who did not usurp much of our time, made a very agreeable impression; but other batteries generally were silenced by Mr. Seward, who was well worth listening to. Some one mentioned "an extra session." Mr. Seward said "No! No extra session! Neither the President nor I want it! Kings who call parliaments sometimes lose their heads." He treated secession lightly. "Why, I, and all my brothers and sisters seceded in early life. But we all returned home. So will the Southern States. The masses there are ignorant; they think they can rule the North first and the world after. The style of life there is that which prevailed in New York a hundred years ago." As to the Tariff, which Mr. Anthony and Mr. Foster did not like, he was certain there would be no inconvenience from it. "The rumor that orders had been given to evacuate Fort Sumter, was false—it belongs to the Union, not to South Carolina." One story, told rather late in the evening, was, I suppose, a little decorated. Mr. Seward, who had been received with great respect in Russia, came to England, and naturally desired to go to Court. He was

to be presented at the levee, by the United States Minister, as a Senator of the United States. He drove off to the palace, but he was stopped in the corridor by a gentleman in uniform, who said he could not pass. "Why so? Here are my cards and those of my Minister, who is to present me." "You are not properly dressed, sir." "I was in full evening dress, black dress coat, vest and trousers, and a white cravat, but it would not do. The gentleman explained that I must have knee breeches, shoes and stockings—that was absolutely necessary. An idea struck me. There was a nice old man about my size, the porter of the hotel I was staying at, who sat in a box in the hall, and off I drove. Immense success! The porter had a beautiful new pair of knee breeches, and black silk stockings, and dress shoes. A few dollars for the loan was all that was needed. I was speedily equipped and drove back to the palace. I was passed on to the room where the Minister was awaiting me, and finally had the pleasure of making my bow in the hotel porter's clothes to the Majesty of England!" Now all that is changed, and American citizens attend European courts in plain evening dress.

Next day I called on Mr. Seward and walked with him to the White House to be presented to President Lincoln. Many of the gentlemen I had seen at Willard's were in the ante-room. The hall porter, a burly old Irishman, was amusing them with social and political anecdotes of Daniel Webster. The porter had seen six or seven Presidents enter and leave the White House. "I am," said he, "the most ancient institution in Washington." Presently Mr. Seward, who had left me for a few minutes, returned. I followed him into a room, plainly but handsomely furnished, and thence into a smaller one, in the centre of which stood the President. I do not suppose that the appearance of any man, not even that of Prince Bismarck, is better known to the world; but I have never seen any likeness which conveyed the melancholy tender expression of Mr. Lincoln's eyes—soft, full, and bright—all the rest of the large-featured, dark skinned, deeply seamed face, almost morose in the cast of the square jaws, firm mouth and hollow cheek. Tall, over six feet certainly, loose limbed, with long arms and large flapping hands, dressed in a shining new black cloth suit, he balanced himself uneasily on his feet. As he took a step to meet me with outstretched hand, there

came a most pleasant expression and a kindly honest look into his eyes. "You are welcome." What a squeeze that was! My fingers tingled afterwards. But I was avenged at the first reception, when a many-handed monster—2,000 at least—had as many shakes out of the President's hand.

I cannot remember all he said. At the very moment when he was enforcing on my attention the fact that he was, above all things, bound to uphold the Constitution of the United States, Mr. Seward came in with two foreign gentlemen, one with a few orders, in evening dress—the Chevalier or Cavaliero Bertinatti, Minister of the King of Piedmont, the other his secretary. The former presented his letter of credence with a polite speech to which Mr. Lincoln made a prepared reply; when they had retired Mr. Lincoln expressed his satisfaction that a great English newspaper like *The Times* had taken such a just view of the crisis, as was presented in the letters of their New York correspondent.

In the evening I dined with Mr. Seward—only Miss Seward, her brother, Mr. Sandford and one other gentleman at table, secretary of the Brussels Legation.

As I was leaving, Mr. Seward said to me: "You are invited to dine with the President to-morrow. It is an occasion. It is his first dinner with his cabinet ministers, and you will meet them all—no one else but ourselves! When I called next day on Lord Lyons and excused myself from dining with him that evening at the Legation, because I was invited to the White House, he looked surprised. "That is a great honor they do you." All the same the honor rather troubled me, for the secession controversy was not intelligible to me, and to these keen practised politicians it would appear very presumptuous in me to write about them. I was uneasy. Sam Ward called in the morning. "You will find them ordinary people—good honest folk most of them. Chase is a remarkable man and worth talking to. He won't praise all his colleagues. Cameron is as 'cute as any Yankee alive or dead. Smith and Co. are just respectable people."

Senator Sumner, a large man with a fine presence and imposing manner, also favored me with a visit and talked a good deal about opinion in England. He broke out with an emphatic "Never!" when I spoke of the possibilities of armed conflict between the seceding States and the Government. "Never!

They are too crafty! Bullies! Braggarts! They would be assassins some of them if they dared—but fair fight, never!”

Dinner at the White House was at 5:30, and I went there about ten minutes before the time. The hall porter was surprised to see me. “Are you quite sure it’s to-day?” he asked, when I showed him Mr. Seward’s memorandum. “Well, let me take care of your hat and coat for you. The company wouldn’t take them, but when the citizens come later on, I’ve known it hard to recover property if it’s left outside.”

A very earnest and animated conversation, in which men and measures, the infamous Democrats, the recognition of the cotton States, Buchanan’s treasons, money, the tariff, Fort Sumter, the attitude of Europe, the coming of the Southern Commissioners, were discussed, lasted throughout dinner.

After the company left the table, the President beckoned to me and continued his conversation with Mr. Smith, the Home Secretary. “‘And so you think I have done wrong in appointing Judge Brown, do you? Now do you know I am of opinion he’s quite a fit man for the place, and he did me a good turn many a year ago. I will tell you what it was. I was marching along to—— Court house with my books and no briefs in my bag, on a bad corduroy road, when the Judge overtakes me in his coach. ‘Are you going to Court, Mr. Lincoln?’ says he. ‘I am, sir’, says I. ‘Then take a seat,’ says he, and I did. He went on reading his book till presently the coach bumped against a snag, and the Judge and I knocked our heads together. ‘Are you hurt, Mr. Lincoln?’ says he. ‘No, Judge,’ says I, ‘and I hope you’re not either.’” In five minutes more there was a terrible shock and our skulls rattled like dried pumpkins. ‘This has happened several times before you came in, Mr. Lincoln,’ said the Judge, ‘but there was only one head in the coach! What can it be?’” I looked out and saw the coachman had been dealing in the spirit line, and I intimated my belief to the Judge. He is a fiery man, you know, Smith, and so he shouts out, ‘You are drunk, you scoundrel! How dare you! You are drunk!’ The coachman turned his head—he was a countryman of yours, Mr. Russell—and says, with a wink, ‘Judge! I am! You’ve hit it off! And begorra! It’s the first rightful decision you’ve delivered this

twelvemonth.'” Under the cover of the laughter which followed the anecdote the President stalked off to talk to another Secretary.

In the seething caldron of Willard’s Hotel there was no repose. Out of it there was not much either. I had one lucid interval ; a day at the Smithsonian with Professor Henry and Professor Baird. The former treated slavery as a geological question ; the latter connected it with climate and the Valley of the Mississippi. One day I breakfasted with Olmsted, an ardent enemy of slavery and author of *A Visit to the Southern States*, which was more powerful and convincing than *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. Another morning I lunched with Mr. Corcoran, almost an avowed rebel to the Federal Government. I frequently dined at the Legation, where diplomatists were to be found—M. Stoeckl, the Russian, with a very charming American wife, M. Geoffroi, the French, and Tessara, the Spanish minister ; Roost Van Limbourg (Holland), and the *personnel* of the Legation, Brodie, Jenner, Warre, Anderson. One day I spent with Mr. Seward at the State Department ; dining with Senator Douglass, to meet Senator Chase, Mr. Smith, Minister of the Interior, Mr. Forsyth, one of the Southern, or as the abolition papers called them, “Rebel Commissioners,” in the evening. The same evening I had a note from Mr. Seward to call upon him, and from 9 o’clock p. m. till 1.30 a. m., I sat and listened to a long despatch to Mr. Adams in London, instructing him to resist the recognition of the Confederate States to the very uttermost. It would constitute an interference in a domestic quarrel and be a *casus belli*. In arguing against recognition he was not to attack the South or its institutions or make any reference to slavery and he was to treat the tariff question as unimportant.

Events were crowding on each other, gathering momentum every day. To my eye they all tended to war. Mr. Seward quite approved of my resolve to visit the Southern States and to see things as they were there for myself.

Lord Lyons coincided in the opinion that it would be well if I could visit the South where they were all on fire, arming and drilling. On the last day of March, I visited the navy yard and spent some time going over it with Commodore Dahlgren, who was very proud of his huge soda-water-bottle guns, throwing 250 pounds hollow shot. He told me in confidence he was doing his best to provide a respectable force for blockading pur-

poses. "We can't do much that way at present." He spoke bitterly of the naval officers who had thrown up their commissions and gone over to the South. Lord Lyons, to whom I mentioned the point, remarked that he could not say it was proper that Southern officers imbued with States rights principles should secede with their States, but that it was natural. Senator Sumner, who was dining at the Legation, condemned them as "traitors." "They entered the service of the United States, not of any one State."

The most difficult of the politicians, of whom I met many every day, was Senator Douglass, not that he was ambiguous in speech, but that he was so subtle and overflowing. A small man with a large head and flashing eyes full of energy—"the Little Giant" as he was called. Just returned from a political tour, he was full of his theories—*totus in illis*—but he was an all-round man and one of the finest speakers in America. Hearing I was going to Mount Vernon, he exclaimed: "Visiting our Mecca! But how much greater than Mahomet was George Washington! The work he did is not to perish, sir, as long as the world lasts."

On April 11th I dined with General Scott. He was warming some bottles of claret—excellent it proved to be—when I arrived. Mr. Seward, Mr. Bates, and Colonel Cullum dropped in. As we sat down to dinner a regiment of U. S. Cavalry, the 6th, Colonel Emory, passed before our windows, then a military band took up a position in the street outside and played "Hail Columbia," "The Star Spangled Banner," and other patriotic airs.

The conversation was very interesting. The general told us how he had made the acquaintance of two members of the House of Lords. The State of Virginia, in 1812, had forbidden the supply of the British fleet in Chesapeake Bay with fresh meat and vegetables just before the war was declared. Scott, in command of a small body of State cavalry, pounced down one night on some country carts delivering the forbidden articles to a British man-of-war's launch. He took the crew prisoners before they could pull off, but the young officer in command made a vigorous resistance, and Scott, who had ridden into the water, had to seize him by the collar and force him out of the boat. He took his captives to Richmond, but instead of being praised he was severely censured and ordered to repair on board the flagship of the British Admiral to surrender

the prisoners and make an apology for exceeding his duty, which was to prevent the victualling of the fleet from the shore. When war was declared Scott was ordered to join the American forces which had invaded Canada. At the battle of Lundy's Lane he saw a young officer of the Guards standing with his back to a wall, badly wounded, and warding off the bayonets of some American soldiers, who were calling on him to surrender. "I will," said he, "to an officer; not to you!" He gave up his sword to Scott, who had his wound attended to, and looked after him till he was released at the end of the war. The prisoner was Lord Gifford, afterward the Marquis of Tweeddale. Scott, when he visited England many years afterward, renewed his acquaintance. One night, at dinner with his quondam captive, a gentleman regarded him intently, and at last said, "May I ask, sir, if you are the young Virginian who charged my boat and took me and the crew prisoners in 1812?" It was Lord Tweeddale's brother, Admiral Lord John Hay. General Scott told us he had frequent letters from the Marquis of Tweeddale about the operations of the United States army in case of actual hostilities with the South, and that his lordship particularly insisted on the importance of getting the command of the Mississippi, "a name," said the General, "which his lordship never could spell quite correctly."

Mr. Seward told me General Scott aimed at being a poet as well as a soldier, and in a letter to the *National Intelligencer* he quoted Paley and Shakespeare to show that President Buchanan should have fortified the United States ports, "but he was a grand old fellow in the field. He is the only General I know of whose orders of the day in the morning would serve in the afternoon as records of work done."

He was interrupted by an orderly with a despatch, which he read with evident emotion. It was from the President on Cabinet business. He handed the despatch to Mr. Seward, who looked inquiringly at General Scott, who only shook his head. Then the paper was passed on to Mr. Bates, who, starting as he read it, handed the document across to General Scott, who, on some remark from Mr. Seward, after reading it twice over, crumpled it up and threw it into the fire. It was, in effect, I believe, a despatch to the President to announce that the Charleston batteries were about to open fire on Fort Sumter if the United States officer, Major Anderson, did not surrender it, and that they had fired on a

vessel under the United States flag which tried to enter the harbor.

That night, as we were sitting in General Scott's modest room, the curtain was raised on the first scene of the grand drama of infinite anxiety, misery, and bloodshed, which was to endure for three long years, with all the world as spectators.

Next day Washington was in the wildest excitement. The newsboys were shouting out: "Bombardment of Fort Sumter!" The news was not true, but there was no doubt of the determination to open fire if the garrison did not surrender. That evening, April 12, I left the capital and arrived at Baltimore at 8 o'clock. There I heard that the Charleston batteries had actually opened fire on the Federal fort.

I had already made preparations for my journey South without any knowledge of the exceeding gravity of the issue to be decided by the action of the State authorities of South Carolina, and the news in the daily papers indicated that there was no time to be lost in setting out on my journey.

In that connection a curious circumstance occurred. A young fellow of insinuating manners and pleasing appearance waited on me one day, and asked if he might travel South with me as an artist to illustrate my journey. "But how do you know I am going South?" "I guess you are bound to do it." "*The Times* does not publish illustrations." "But other papers do." Then he told me he was an artist for an illustrated weekly paper of New York, and unguardedly I said that if I went South I would allow him to accompany me. "Only one favor more. It need not be mentioned that I am an artist for a particular paper, I hope?" "Certainly not," said I. So it was that when I entered the Confederate States I was shielding, *à mon insu*, the correspondent, as Mr. Davis was, of a strong abolition journal, for he followed and overtook me on the way to Charleston.

The news of the bombardment, to my utter astonishment, seemed to give the utmost satisfaction at the Eutaw House. Next day, at 4 p. m., I hurried on board the steamer for Norfolk, and arrived early next morning and put up at the Atlantic Hotel. "Yes, sir! Fort Sumter has surrendered! The Yankees are prisoners! Have a drink?" Telegram after telegram—a rush from every room as each was put up. There was one man in the coffee-room next morning, at breakfast. I sat at the same table

and exchanged some remarks with him, but he was not inclined to talk with a stranger about events of such import. It was only when I saw his portrait later on that I knew it was General Robert Lee !

The mere political turmoil I had left behind me at Washington had, in the course of a few hours, hardened before my eyes into the stern resistance of great States of the Union to the government of the United States by armed force, and the people around me were in a delirium of exultation at the success of the rebellious bombardment of a fortress under the national flag.

I had seen that Sabbath day the vessels of the United States Navy—the huge three-decker “*Pennsylvania*,” the “*Merrimac*,” the “*Cumberland*,” and others lying placidly moored in the stream off the great range of building sheds and dockyard stores of the Gosport Navy Yard, and I had been confidentially informed that the river was so blocked seaward that the ships never could get away “to the d——d Yankees.” There seemed not to be the least evidence or trace of power or authority on the part of the national government. The United States flag hung, indeed, from the flagstaffs of the men-of-war and on the public buildings and government stores of Portsmouth and Gosport, but I had seen a crowd of uncouth “citizens” on the quay pelting the crew of a man-of-war’s boat with oyster shells, and I had heard them jeering at the “cussed old flag.”

The faces of the people, white, black, and brown, beamed with joy. Bands of men and boys yelling “Bully for Charleston” made the night hideous. It was a saturnalia. What would the President do ? How would the people of the North assert themselves ? Was Fort Sumter a Bastile ? Had the federal government gone down before a revolution like a Bourbon or an Orleans dynasty ? At all events there was apparently a great drama opening in a grand theatre, and I was bound to see what I could of the play.

That night at the Atlantic Hotel made an indent on my memory never to be beaten out by the hammer of Sam Ward’s “dreadful auctioneer,” who counts the moments one by one, “going ! gone ! going ! gone ! ” For the full conception of the business at hand came upon me quite suddenly.

With the dawn I was up and moving, and in good faith, the mosquitoes and less volatile but not less sanguinary insects in the

Atlantic Hotel had not given me leave to oversleep myself. I took the first ferryboat to Portsmouth, and was accommodated by Mr. Robinson, the superintendent, with a seat in the engine-car of a train on the Roanoke Railway. I have a vivid recollection of my journey through "the Dismal Swamp" over which the train made its way, miraculously upheld on creaking trestles, piled in tiers over black lakes, bordered by forests of cypress and pine, hung with strands of Spanish moss, the tops of which were below the line. Often my heart was in my mouth as I saw the whole fabric shake, heard its dreadful lamentations and gazed into the depths below. The country was "a remnant of the old world at its exit from the flood." We came out at last, passing an awful Slough of Despond, called Lake Drummond, on a miserable land. No more alligators or turtles were visible, but wretched looking people, exceeding pale and tall, "thin and ribbed like the sea sand," were gathered at the stations in riotous spirits. There were myriads of very frisky pigs everywhere, often on the line. "These pigs are very thin," said I to the engineer. "Don't *you* know that it takes three North Carolina hogs to make a shadow?" quoth he. That engineer was a rabid secessionist—also an ardent sportsman. He wanted to "draw a bead" on "Abe," Sumner, and the lot of them, and he imparted to me at intervals curious information about wild turkeys, deer, and bear, to which I paid indifferent attention, as I was anxious he should not neglect his driving. At Blackwater Station some thirty or forty men in various uniforms, fine fighting material to look at, the "Jeff Davis Guards," were going on to Glory and Richmond, and preparing for the journey by copious libations. And so on, though North Carolina had not seceded, there were militia or volunteers on the warpath at every station. "We're bound to go! Hurrah for Jeff Davis!"

At every station the crowds were all cheering—men, women, and children, black and white. Some were drunk, all noisy and jubilant. Many carried shotguns, old rifles, and revolvers. The men boarded the train and exchanged "news," mostly fabulous, with the passengers. They were going to take Forts Macon and Caswell, and "drive the Yankees to ——. That's sure!" But I was told by a fellow-traveller that those forts had no garrison in them.

At the first of the "wooding-up" halting places I saw my

first Confederate flag. Thenceforward for weeks I saw no other.

As the train progressed southwards the country and the people improved in appearance. The enthusiasm for "Jeff Davis" was unbounded, especially among the women, who waved Confederate flags from the log houses in the little villages.

At Goldsborough the insurrectionary furor was at its height. North Carolina was arraying her forces to seize the Federal forts on her coast—an armed mob, bands playing "Dixie's Land," followed by yelling crowds, filled the streets. Flags—"the Stars and Bars"—waved on all sides; women held them aloft from windows and doorways, and threw garlands of flowers to the warriors. I was seriously advised at Griswold's Hotel, where the passengers dined, to go out and listen to an oration from a States Rights man; but I was hungry and preferred to eat my dinner, which was carved and served by two black damsels, worth, I was informed, "a thousand dollars each."

I hope I am not wearying my reader with these details of a short railway journey, but it was through a country strange to me, filled with a population as possessed by revolutionary passion as the sections of the Parisian Jacobins—as the mobs of 1793, 1830, 1848. The end of the long day and evening was welcome in a vile shed at Wilmington Station. As I stepped out on the platform I saw lights gleaming and heard cheers and yells and the sound of drums and many voices in the town. I sent off a telegram to London by Mr. Davis, the artist I have mentioned. He came back pale and trembling; he had been pounced upon by a Vigilance Committee, closely examined as to his business and mine, and finally told that they would not let the telegram go, but that they would call round and see me.

The great cities of the North were on fire. The challenge of the South had been taken up! President Lincoln had issued a proclamation calling on the Governors of the States of the Union to furnish *pro rata* 75,000 volunteers to serve for three months "to suppress insurrection." The Western and New England and Northern States were in a blaze of angry determination to crush secession. *Alea jacta est*. But who is the Cæsar and where is the Rubicon?

W. H. RUSSELL.

(To be Continued.)

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE CONSUMERS' LABEL.

MR. STARR HOYT NICHOLS, in his article, "Another View of the Union Label,"* strikes a note which must appeal with force to those consumers who desire to aid in every effort which would tend to up-lift wage-earners, but who have not felt justified in endorsing the "Union Label"; for, unintentionally, he suggests how the advantages of the label may be secured without its disadvantages.

While it is true that "to support producers in fine style has never been the professed purpose of buyers," still there is a large contingent of the buying public that desire to buy only goods which have been made under wholesome conditions, and have been fairly paid for.

It is a fact that the mass of shoppers are selfish, are thoughtless, are eager only to obtain the greatest bargains at the least cost to themselves; yet there are many who recognize the fact that the lowest-priced goods are not always the cheapest in the end, and that disease or death is the real cost in many instances, not only to producers but to purchasers as well.

There are many conscientious, thoughtful people who would prefer to buy goods that bore some distinguishing mark as a guarantee that they were made under sanitary conditions, and that they did not represent the "sweated" toil of hard-pressed workers, who had been forced to accept starvation wages.

Among these conscientious buyers would naturally be classed the large number of shoppers who have joined The Consumers' League. This League was organized some seven years ago for the purpose of "ameliorating the condition of women and children in mercantile establishments." After the passage of the mercantile law its scope of work was extended and one of its present purposes is to endeavor to form a public opinion which will lead consumers to recognize their responsibilities for all the conditions under which goods are made as well as sold.†

The advocates of the Union Label claim that their method is the best way to advance the interests of consumers and producers. Mr. Nichols very justly contends, however, that the Union Label primarily stands for increasing the power of Trades Unions, and that, although the workers are required to belong to unions, and must not accept less than the established minimum wage, no test is required of the quality of the work, nor is the label a guarantee that it has been done outside of tenement houses.

* Published in the October number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

† Similar organizations have been formed in Philadelphia and Brooklyn, and are about to be formed in Boston, Baltimore, and Chicago.

What we need, therefore, is a label which will not arbitrarily exact that the workers should belong to labor organizations, but which would insure to the purchaser : 1st. Sanitary conditions in the production ; 2d. A living wage to the producer ; 3d. Good workmanship ; 4th. The indorsement of the Factory Inspector ; and 5th, the option of its use by all manufacturers who can prove that they fulfil the necessary conditions.

Such a label would be an advantage to the producer, to the buyer, to the merchant, and to the manufacturer. Moreover, this label could rightfully be called the "Consumers' Label" (to distinguish it from the "Union Label"), and, if adopted by the leading merchants of any one city, it would soon force its way into universal use. All merchants would have to adopt it, or lose their custom as soon as the purchasing public understood its nature.

In the commercial rivalry between the great cities of the country, the conditions under which merchandise is manufactured must, of necessity, command more and more attention, and may, indeed, prove a deciding factor in the struggle for business. Massachusetts claims to have no sweat-shop work done within her borders, owing to her stringent laws and the proper enforcement of them. Massachusetts' inspectors also have the authority to examine goods sent for sale from other States. Boston merchants have already shown a disposition to co-operate with consumers by ascertaining under what conditions goods are made. A well-known Philadelphia firm has advertised recently that the underwear sold over its counters was made in farmhouses "under pure, healthful conditions, and not in sweat-shops." This is a sign of the times, a sign that the public is being educated to demand how its garments are manufactured, just as it has been taught to demand how its meat is inspected and slaughtered, and under what conditions its bread is made in the bakeshops.

As a proof that the subject of sweat-shop goods is considered an important problem, and one that concerns the commerce of cities, let me state that a short time ago a letter was received by The Consumers' League from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Vienna, Austria, asking for a report of the League's work, and mentioning that the members had heard of the efforts of the League to induce merchants not to sell goods made in sweat-shops, and that this action against the sweating system was a most interesting one to the members of that body.

If the buyers of the Merchants' Association of New York pursue their policy of getting goods at the lowest prices possible, regardless of conditions of production, disease germs may be spread all over the country.

Mr. John Franey, Assistant State Factory Inspector, testified in 1896, before the Reinhard Committee, that there were between 5,000 and 6,000 sweat-shops in New York, and that it was impossible for the Factory Inspectors to visit all these places as often as they ought to be visited. In one year 4,200 sweat-shops were inspected, and of these about 1,200 were re-inspections. One hundred and sixty sweaters were arrested and fined in this county, and the sum of \$2,400 in fines was paid.

Mr. Franey also stated that there are about 385 wholesale clothing manufacturers, and not more than about 15 make the clothing exclusively in their own shops. When contracts are made between contractors or "sweaters" and the employees or "sweated," no sanitary conditions are mentioned. In one instance, scarlet fever was found to have been in the rooms where clothing was being made. The Factory Inspector notified the Board of Health to fumigate, but had no power to seize the goods and have

them fumigated without delay. Before the Board of Health could attend to the matter, and in spite of precautionary measures being taken, the goods were sent out to the wholesale merchant and could not then be distinguished. I quote verbatim from some further testimony given by Mr. Franey:

Q. Mr. Mayer: As a matter of fact, one of the great dangers of the sweating system is that goods go out of the shops, or dwelling-houses where they are made and where there may be infectious diseases?

A. Mr. Franey: Yes, sir, that is the great danger; that is the danger that the people at large suffer under the system; the dangers of the people employed, I think, are equal in the same direction, in addition to these other abuses which are in the system.

Q. But the general public is under that constant danger, namely, that goods go out of houses, or shops, where there are infectious diseases.

A. Yes, sir; that has hurt the business in the city of New York to some extent.

Q. What business?

A. The clothing business. At one time there was a good deal of alarm created through rumors of diseases, which hurt the manufacturers of clothing, and the business was transferred to other cities. I think it would be profitable for the manufacturers of clothing in this city to advertise that they do not have their goods made in anything but good wholesome buildings.

If the only stipulation be that goods must be procured at low prices, then manufacturers, in their keen competition to undersell their neighbors, will naturally crush down the wages of the workers, and make the present bad conditions even worse.

Of what use is it to "build up commerce" if the standard of living and the welfare of the wage-earners are not to be built up too?

The following is a list of some of the prices paid in New York at the present time for sweat-shop work:

Cambric dresses, waists, lined and trimmed, \$1.20 a dozen; nightgowns, with embroidery and tucked yokes—thread furnished and embroidery cut out by maker—\$1.00 a dozen; silk waists, 98 cents a dozen; women's wrappers, 49 cents a dozen; shirts, 30 cents a dozen; aprons, 22 cents a dozen; neckties, \$1.25 a gross; knee-pants, 59 to 75 cents a dozen; vests, \$1.00 to \$3.00 a dozen; trousers, 12½ cents to 75 cents per pair; coats, 32 cents to \$1.50 each; percentage off for Boss sweaters and deduction for cost of cartage.

These are not "living wages" under present conditions, they are *dying wages*, and the purchaser of such goods is responsible for them. It is a well-established economic fact that purchasers create what they purchase. Their desires create the economic demands. Therefore, when we purchase the product of sweat shops we help to maintain them.

The manager of one of New York's leading stores and two members of Boston firms have stated that they could ascertain a great deal about the conditions under which their goods are manufactured, if their customers showed any desire to obtain such information. Therefore, if buyers are conscientious and persistent, they will insist that merchants give to them a guarantee of the wholesomeness of the goods that they sell, and merchants will then insist that manufacturers provide them with such a guarantee.

Notwithstanding its name, consumers would not be responsible for the proposed label. It would be awarded by the Factory Inspector, and would serve as the crest of noble manufacturers, each of whom would zealously guard it, so that none who did not deserve it could use it.

The State provides factory inspectors who are instructed to look into the sanitary conditions under which goods are made. When inspectors find that goods are made in violation of the provisions of the factory act, they are required to place a tag on such goods, bearing the words "tenement made." These tags can be removed by the local board of health after the garments have been disinfected.

At present the State does not concern itself with the wages of producers, nor does it make any effort to procure good workmanship.

But the problem of "the living wage" will be solved only when work is no longer unskilled. It will be the duty of the State to demand a high standard of workmanship when it provides for the training of the workman.

Where the experiment has been made it has been found that it is a more economical and better policy for the government to provide training schools for manual labor than to support prisons and workhouses.

Dr. H. H. Belfield, in a report to the United States Commission of Labor, stated that officers of manual training schools all over the country testify to the good effects of training upon the character. "It develops judgment, earnestness, readiness, independence, self-respect, enthusiasm, accuracy, steadiness, persistence. The will is disciplined, the mind is broadened and made more logical, with a tendency to original investigation, and habits of industry are formed. Above all, it teaches the nobility of labor and inculcates a love for it."

The State of New Jersey duplicates any sum under \$5,000 per annum which may be given to found or maintain any manual training school.

In advancing the claims of the "Consumers' Label," I believe I have met all the objections summed up by Mr. Nichols against the "Union Label."

Mr. Nichols may be right when he says that we must wait many years for a label in which "there would be no profit for any special class, no money for its promoters, no power for its advocates, but only general benevolence and fair play for all." All reforms take time and involve the education of the public and the growth of popular sentiment before they can be realized; but the time will come when consumers will recognize their moral responsibility, and will no more purchase goods without feeling reasonably confident that they have been made under conditions which are beneficial to both the producer and the consumer, than they would now be willing to purchase goods which they know to be stolen.

It is a hopeful sign that institutions which stand for education and progress have evinced a deep interest in the work of The Consumers' League. Colleges, women's clubs, ethical societies and church associations have shown a spirit of sympathy and co-operation.

The public is being aroused from its lethargy, and when it is thoroughly awakened to its responsibilities, buyers will consider it quite as important to ask for wholesome goods as for cheap goods.

The labor organizations have done much for the cause of the workingman. They have raised the standard of living of the wage-earner, reduced the number of hours in the working day, secured legislation to limit child labor, and have corrected many other abuses and evils. These reforms without organized effort could never have been accomplished.

The entire economy of industrial labor has been uplifted, has received an impetus, has been endowed with a dignity, has had breathed into it a

spirit of hope and cheer as a result of the persistent and unwearying efforts of the intelligent workingmen who stand at the head of their federations.

It remains for conscientious consumers to assist unorganized labor, labor too weak and unskilled to organize and help itself, by guiding it out of the slough of despond and despair where the indifferent, the careless buyers have been content to leave it.

MAUD NATHAN.

NARCOTIC INEBRIETY IN AMERICA.

NARCOTIC inebriety in America is on the wane. In this fact—of which I have convincing proof—is the cause for profound gratulation to every well-wisher of his kind.

Before the advent of sub-cutaneous medication this disease was comparatively unknown. Prior to the sixth decade of this century opium was mainly used among the lower classes, who, from tradition or craving for stimulants peculiar to some people, made use of the crude drug, or its tincture. But, with the coming of the hypodermatic syringe, and the widespread popularity of this mode of treatment, coupled with ignorance of its seductive power and pernicious consequences, it took on a steady growth that, for more than forty years, involved a host of victims, and brought more of sorrow to soul and body than the world will ever know.

Soon after the advent of this remedial device came our war, which gave beyond question an immense impetus to the growth of this disease. What with the vast amount of suffering from wounds and illness incident to that four years' conflict, and its remote sequence of broken health, and, above all, a general failure to realize the risk of untoward effect from increasingly prevalent hypodermic morphia medication, little wonder that, sparing neither sex, state nor condition, it numbered its victims by hundreds of thousands, and became a grave menace to private and public weal.

In 1869 a new form of this toxic neurosis was added—chloralism. Early reports of the non-inebriating effect of this hypnotic, which is without a peer for certain purposes, were found fallacious, for chemical records soon presented many cases of chronic poisoning due to its over use.

Sixteen years later came cocaine, which, though a blessing along certain remedial lines, in time brought a bane, the ravages of which on brain and brawn, especially the former—for its fascinating seductiveness is unique, its destructive energy appalling—gave it indisputable rank as the greatest wrecker of mind and body known.

These three—morphine, chloral, cocaine, mainly morphine—are the triple factors in the great wave of narcotic inebriety that has rolled over this land the last forty years.

The point of greatest import in this paper is the fact that the ebb of the toxic tide has begun. Various causes have tended to this glad end. Concerning cocaine, the most potent has been an appreciation by the profession of the mistaken statements of some writers as to its specific value in certain ills and its non-noxious power in all, and a realization of the risk attending its incautious use. That the unwarranted assertions made by prominent physicians as to the harmlessness of this drug had much to do with the rise and growth of cocaine inebriety in this country is beyond question. The full measure of that harm can never be known, and we may well felicitate ourselves that this dreadful disease is, increasingly, a thing of the past.

Regarding chloral inebriety, the larger use of less snareful hypnotics—notably trional—has led, most of all, to its decline.

Respecting opium inebriety three causes have conduced to its lessened growth. First, morphine, as an anodyne, has been largely supplanted by codeine, which, while effective as a pain reliever, lacks almost wholly that subtle power which makes morphia so likely to enslave. Second, by the coal tar products, notably phenacetine, the value of which in this regard is beyond dispute; and by the use of electricity. Touching the latter, we wish to lay special stress on the galvanic current as a power against pain and to express a belief that it is not appreciated and made use of by medical men in general to an extent at all equal to what its merit deserves. Third, the use of morphine subcutaneously is much less common these later years. Syringes once ready are now rusty. The import of this change for the better will best be appreciated by realizing the fact that this mode of morphia medication is the most riskful as regards inebriety. "Facile but fatal" often may truly be said of it.

In this reform—much needed and most hopeful—the fathers of our fraternity have led. Out of their experience has been evolved an improvement along this line, to the furtherance of which junior members of the profession may well attend. The well being—present and future—of many is in their keeping. May they discharge that trust as will best conserve the interests confided to their care.

J. B. MATTISON.

AN APPEAL TO WOMANHOOD.

THE world unconsciously loves and reverences womanhood. Why should this be so? Is it not because woman is indeed blessed when she can become a mother, and through the beauty of heaven-born laws be brought heart to heart with her Creator as she learns the mystery and the wonder of the gift of life? Oh, mothers! as you hold your little ones to your breast—those little lives which have taught you what life can be in the thrilling, overpowering might of its joy, would you not be shocked if the world called you cruel inflictors of agony, guilty of wanton thoughtlessness, and wicked destroyers of life?

Do not let us be too careful of words. The women of our country have a question to answer. Let them hear facts, and then let us pray that they will give their decision with true nobility of character and in womanliness of soul.

This is the message:

In one year 5,000,000 birds were slaughtered to bedeck women's bonnets, 1,000,000 bobolinks were bereft of life, 70,000 song birds' notes were stilled that their plumage might be used for millinery purposes.

If every woman could realize that a hat trimmed with aigrettes was ornamented at the expense of a little mother life, would she still wish their adornment? Aigrettes are obtained in the breeding season, when the mother bird—anxious to protect her young—will not hover far from the nest, and thus is an easy mark for the sportsman. Then when the proud, happy mother is gone, killed in the moment of her terror, the cries of the hungry baby birds are left for the echoes of the woods to soothe until death, at last, hushes them into stillness.

Women laugh in their thoughtlessness at sentiments akin to these, calling them the foolish exaggerations of one of nature's enthusiasts. They

cannot see the necessity of going without the wings and aigrettes which make their headgear more stylish and becoming. "What are a few among many?" they say. "These ornaments are in the shops. We did not kill the birds."

Pardon me: you are as much a murderer, at least, as the hunter sent at your demands to bring those bird lives for sacrifice to the altar of your love for fashion. You will wear the evidence of a cruelty, and smile and be merry under the burden of your guilt.

Words can go but a short way, can mean so little. I would that they could bring to the understanding of all those who read this magazine that the question which these facts present is no small matter, not the clamoring of a few alarmists, but a menacing evil, a terrible possibility which is threatening our land.

Our vegetation would suffer more than can be estimated from the countless number of destroying insects, were it not for the birds who consume them. Aside from this, what would it be without the little heralds of dawn, who have so much brightness in their hearts that they know the coming of light before it has fairly crept into the blue of the sky?

What would nature do if the sunshine of the world were not put to music in the trees? Think of a Spring without the love calls of the birds! Can we get along without our songsters in the land? Then how can we stop their destruction? Only by women, in one great body and in the love of humanity, standing up for the right; lifting their voices in one mighty chorus of determination against this awful devastation of life and song, this sacrifice of joyous existence to vain desire for ornament.

It is only by individuals resolving not to wear the evidences of bird destruction that an army can be raised to save the glad songsters' lives.

The shops are again this year displaying countless birds' wings and aigrettes for winter wear. Fashion magazines are once more informing their readers that bird ornaments will continue to be exceedingly fashionable.

Can humanity's pleadings be heard above fashion's clamor?

Let us trust that women will answer as becomes their womanhood.

EDITH ROBERTS.